UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
3 1761 01304210 6

LITERARY BYPATHS OF THE RENAISSANCE

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026 with funding from
University of Toronto

https://archive.org/details/literarybypathso0000thom_s3r4

T4696kx

LITERARY BYPATHS
OF
THE RENAISSANCE

BY
ELBERT N. S. THOMPSON
PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH
THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

349422
13. 4. 38.

NEW HAVEN: YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON · HUMPHREY MILFORD · OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
MDCCCCXXIV

PN
511
T53
1924

COPYRIGHT 1924 BY YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

PREFACE

IN the summer of 1921 two short sketches, one of the business man, the other of the actress, appeared in *Life*. Very cleverly the author fitted together the details that make up his portraits. The tired business man, we are told, "is invariably slightly bald. He believes that an actress' beauty is only knee deep. At serious dramas, he promptly falls into audible slumber." So, whether the author realized it or not, the count goes on, exactly after the fashion of the character sketches of the seventeenth century. Just as the magazine appeared, I was laboring to prove, by the painstaking methods of modern scholarship, that the character sketch no longer exists as an independent literary form. On the day in question, as *Life* was replaced on the table, some disquieting thoughts ran through my mind.

Is it true that these other literary bypaths of an olden time are still occasionally trodden, that these other old favorites are simply awaiting resuscitation? A treatise on the courtier would now be out of the question; but plenty of advice on conduct can still be had for, or even without, the asking. A letter, also, exactly in the style of King James' days would provoke much comment. Yet some rare correspondents still are able to catch that touch of intimacy so much prized by the familiar letter writers of the Stuart court. Pictures in our modern world are used, though with new mechanical devices, for purposes of instruction; and two recently published books seemingly recall the title of an old volume of emblems, *The Mirrour of Maiestie*. It may therefore be true, as Walter Pater observed, that whatever has once been of genuine interest to the human race never loses its appeal.

Some such idea prompted the studies that comprise this volume. Odd corners of old book-shelves have in themselves a certain charm even for the average reader, and these old books are interesting if for nothing other than their quaintness. But they possess a deeper value. Unquestionably, they influenced strongly the minds of men like Shakespeare, and engrossed, at least for a time, the interest of diverse geniuses like Spenser and Bunyan, Bishop Hall, the Duchess of Newcastle, and James Howell. To know these books, therefore, is to establish contact with the literary tastes of our ancestors, and to see in transitory intellectual fashions traits that are of enduring interest to the human mind.

E. N. S. T.

May 25, 1923.

CONTENTS

Preface v

Character Books 1

Emblem Books 29

War Journalism of the Seventeenth Century . . 69

Familiar Letters 91

Books of Courtesy 127

A Representative Man of Letters 173

CHARACTER BOOKS

ALTHOUGH human nature is said never to change, mankind never tires of self-scrutiny. From the story of the Moabite Ruth to the adventures of the Narcissus' crew, literature has conveyed to us its record of the thoughts and actions of men chiefly by the representation of individual personalities. The figures of David and Saul in the earliest Hebrew chronicles and of Achilles and Hector in the old Homeric epic step forth, clear-cut and convincing in individuality, against the clouded background of an ancient civilization. But occasionally some keen-eyed or sarcastic observer, usually of less creative power, has turned from the individual to a group of individuals, or type. So an ancient Hebrew moralist, in the last chapter of Proverbs, drew up, item by item, his conception of the ideal wife. In the same manner, Chaucer, in beginning the *Canterbury Tales,* introduced his characters as representatives of the stations or callings to which they belonged. And in much more recent times Wordsworth sketched the "Happy Warrior," possibly as a memorial to his dead friend, Beaupuy.

But the character sketch, as it was familiarly known in the seventeenth century, cannot stand alone. An isolated description, or portraits drawn, as Chaucer's were, for some ulterior purpose, leave on the reader hardly the true impresssion of a "character." That literary genre, which attained such popularity in the seventeenth century, aimed, it has been said, to give "a formal enumeration, partly individualized, of the habits and peculiarities that serve to differentiate a social, ethical, or political type."[1] But one might read the *Happy Warrior* or

[1] E. C. Baldwin, *The Relation of the English "Character" to its Greek Prototype. Publications, Modern Language Association,* vol. 18, p. 412.

Chaucer's *Prologue* without associating either with the genre to which it actually belongs. Characters must stand in a series to produce their proper effect, and a fixed intent on the author's part to do one thing and nothing more—that is, to characterize a type or class—seems essential. If the sketches of Theophrastus were written originally to illustrate the teachings of a long moral treatise, as some scholars have thought, and if they never had been grouped in a series, their proper effect would have been missed by the world at large.

Really the first analyses of character to be so arranged together were these Ἠθικοὶ Χαρακτῆρες of Theophrastus. He was an ancient Greek born on the island of Lesbos in the fourth century before Christ. At Athens in his youth he studied under Plato, and later became the favorite disciple of Aristotle. Hence he was appointed to succeed the great philosopher in the direction of the Lyceum. There he wrote over two hundred works in philosophy and the natural sciences, notably botany, and by them won for himself a position of eminence in Athenian society. To-day, he is remembered largely as the author of the *Characters*. Some critics have attempted to prove that they are simply excerpts taken from the author's lost ethical treatise, Περὶ Ἠθῶν. Jebb's view, however, is more satisfactory, that the sketches were written from time to time as recreation for the busy philosopher and circulated at random in incomplete and varying manuscripts.[2] But these vexing questions of modern scholarship had not yet been raised at the time when Theophrastus was universally accepted as the great originator of the character.

In accord with the spirit of the New Comedy and the analytic, introspective habits of his generation, Theophrastus exhibited the men he met in Athens. "I have studied human nature a long time," he begins, "for I have lived nine and ninety years; I have conversed with many men of divers characters, and have been at great pains to observe both good

[2] *The Characters of Theophrastus.* R. C. Jebb and J. E. Sandys, eds. London, 1909. Pp. 16-17.

and bad." Actually, Theophrastus was scarcely past fifty when the sketches were composed, and a portion of this declaration from the Preface must be rejected either as an interpolation or as a jest. But the remainder is amply borne out by the book as a whole.

In form and style the characters of Theophrastus are very simple. Each begins with a definition of the trait under discussion. So we read: "flattery may be sayd to be a foul deformed custom in common life, making for the advantage of the Flatterer"; "garrulity is a slippery loosenesse, or a babling of a long inconsiderate speech"; or "rusticity may seem to be an ignorance of honesty and comliness."[3] From such definition the author proceeds at once to specification. How would such a quality manifest itself in speech or action? The shameless man, for example, will rob a friend and then return to beg a loan; in the market he will scheme to get an extra soup-bone from the butcher; in the theatre he will enjoy the performance at his friends' expense; or at the bath he will dash a pail of water over his head, exclaiming, "That's a good bath; no thanks to you." As a rule, each item introduces us to the character in a new situation. Obviously, there cannot be much continuity in such specification, and the sketches end abruptly, as they begin, either with the last count or a tersely phrased summary.

In these pictures of Athenian life Theophrastus achieved two ends, one conscious, the other, doubtless, unconscious. It was his purpose to reveal with truthful satire the world in which he lived. The New Comedy, which then flourished, sought the same end, and both sprang from the general temper of the time. Consequently, the characters furnish a modern reader with thumb-nail sketches of Athenian society. A ribald fellow, for instance, "when the Hall or Stage is fullest of company, coming to those which sell nuts and apples, and other fruits standing by them, taketh them away and muncheth them; and wrangleth about their price and such like baubles." Or the distrustful

[3] From the first English translation, prepared by John Healey before 1610.

man, "lying in his bed, . . . askes his wife if she have lockt her casket; if his chests be fast lockt; if the doors be fast bolted: and although she assure it, notwithstanding, naked without shoes he riseth out of his bed, lighteth a candle, surveighs all; and hardly falls asleep again for distrust." The market, the wharves, the jury room, the assembly—there one finds the coward, the dullard, the dissembler, and the rest as the ancient Greeks knew them.

At the same time, quite aside from all intention, Theophrastus revealed character in its unchanging aspects, as he knew it and as we to-day know it. The avaricious man is still apt to admonish his wife to this effect, "that she lend out no salt, oyle, meale or the like: for you little think, saith he, what these come to in a year." Dissembling is still "an affectation, whether in word or action, intended to make things seem other than they really are." Newsmongers have always demanded credence of others on the ground, "Why, the story is noised all about the city." And most of us, I suppose, during the era of high prices, resembled the avaricious Greek, who "keeps his patched shoes until they are twice worn out, saying they are still good, and tough as horn."

It has been frequently noted that Theophrastus displays only the warpings of human nature from the norm, and never the virtues. Possibly, had the collection of sketches been preserved in its entirety, such partiality would not be the fact, although "the evil that men do lives after them," while "the good is oft interred with their bones." Or it may be that, writing in the spirit of the New Comedy, and feeling that the business of comedy, as Ben Jonson much later defined it, is to laugh men out of their follies, Theophrastus closed his eyes to all that is sound in human nature. Limited in this way, the philosophy of the book is easily understood. The vices represented, flattery, excessive zeal, meanness, stupidity, and the like, seem to the modern mind scarcely vices. By the Greek, however, they were viewed differently. A violation of taste or a disturbed ethical or social sense, constituted a vice. The book, then, is merely a

concrete rendering of bits of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* or of Theophrastus' own treatise.

How true this is a reader of the English characters should know. Briefly, Aristotle taught that a man is virtuous who acts in obedience to reason. This standard implies moderation in act and word, since either excess or deficiency transforms a virtue into a fault. Hence Aristotle asserted: "The man who shuns and fears everything and never makes a stand, becomes a coward; while the man who fears nothing at all, but will face anything, becomes fool-hardy." Virtue, in short, results from thoroughgoing moderation, and, although some acts are inherently vicious and can never be tempered into virtue, any good trait, by reason of excess or its opposite, may become a vice.

This explains the conception of right and wrong underlying the work of Theophrastus and influencing somewhat his English imitators. The existence of such an interrelation between ethics and social satire was recognized by Aristotle himself. "It will make no difference," he explained, "whether we consider the quality itself, or the man who exhibits the quality." In general, the *Nicomachean Ethics* adopts the former procedure, whereas Theophrastus elects the latter; but occasionally Aristotle, too, introduced a specific illustration. "The buffoon," it is noted, "cannot resist an opportunity for a joke, and, if he can but raise a laugh, will spare neither himself nor others, and will say things which no man of refinement would say, and which he would not even listen to." Again, Aristotle introduced another type in this way: "Now the magnanimous man despises others justly. . . . It is of his nature to confer benefits, but he is ashamed to receive them." Such passages lie halfway between the abstract exposition of other parts of the *Ethics* and the more precise pictures of Aristotle's pupil.

Although the influence of Theophrastus was strong on English authors, it never became altogether dominant. English essays commonly dealt with the virtues as well as the vices. In England, also, women were not exempted from criticism, and at least one woman, Mary Astell, added her contribution

to the rapidly growing list of characters. Finally, in England trades or vocations and even places were subjected to close scrutiny. Hence it is fair to say that the influence of Theophrastus never ruled supreme.

This was due to the indirect and circuitous route by which the Theophrastian tradition reached England, before the *Characters* themselves were actually known. They belonged to the domain of ethics and rhetoric, as well as literature, and were so used in the schools for purposes of moral instruction and rhetorical elaboration. Hence in Wilson's *Arte of Rhetorique*, Descriptio is classed as "an evident declaration of a thing," which, skillfully handled, will "much delite the hearers." His aim and method resemble that of Theophrastus. "We describe the maners of men, when we set them forth in their kinde what they are."[4] Following this idea, Wilson's specimen description of the Covetous Man is decidedly Theophrastian. Nevertheless, the schoolman gave certain new turns to the character. He gave it a latitude that it had not possessed in Athens when he wrote: "not onely are matters set out by description, but men are painted out in their colours, yea, buildings are set foorth, Kingdomes and Realmes are portured, places and times are described." Then Wilson added the remark: "Many people are described by their degree, by their vocation in life." English writers, therefore, of a later time freely handled trades and places and other subjects not touched by Theophrastus; for the character sketch had begun to grow in England before the *Characters* were directly known.

Such description, found in other early works, shows how widely the Theophrastian sketch had spread as a means of rhetorical amplification. In Barclay's translation of the *Narrenschiff* a portrait of a wise man is drawn. Similarly, in Geoffrey Fenton's translation of Guevara's *Epistles,* published in 1577, a marginal note calls attention to the description, A Furious Man. "The angrie and furious man hath these descriptions:

[4] *The Arte of Rhetorique.* 1560. G. H. Mair, ed. Oxford, 1909. See pp. 178-179, 187.

His eyes rolling, his face inflamed, his body trembling, his tongue troubled, his hearte burning, and his handes readie to strike." Later, the "Properties of a true lover" are given in the same way. Such was the *descriptio* as it came to England through the schools.[5]

Starting from an impulse so indirectly conveyed, the earliest English characters leave on the reader an impression of independence. Chaucer's *Prologue* diverges noticeably from the Greek pattern in including so much personal description, a thing that at once destroys the impression of a type. Then in the sixteenth century, when Wilson's treatise was composed, appeared such books as John Audeley's *Fraternity of Vagabonds,*[6] Thomas Harman's *Caveat, or Warning for Common Cursetors,* based largely on Audeley's work, and Thomas Dekker's *Bellman of London.* Each one depicted certain classes of rogues and vagabonds. These books, however, differ both in spirit and technique from the Greek character. The same holds true of the portraiture in Donne's satires. Really, Ben Jonson was the first Englishman to follow purposely and with fidelity the Greek model.

The influence reached him both directly and indirectly. It is generally known that Jonson in 1600 supplemented the list of Dramatis Personae of *Every Man out of his Humour* with a formal picture of each character. Fastidious Brisk, who possibly represented John Lyly, appears as "a neat, spruce, affecting courtier, one that wears clothes well, and in fashion; practiseth by his glass, how to salute; speaks good remnants, notwithstanding the base viol and tobacco; swears tersely, and with variety; cares not what lady's favour he belies, or great man's familiarity: a good property to perfume the boot of a coach." The rest of this sketch and the others follow in like vein. They represent the Theophrastian technique applied more concretely to the individual. Exactly the same is Jonson's picture of Coryate printed in 1611 in the *Crudities.* That such

[5] London, 1577. Pp. 42, 120.

[6] E. E. T. S. extra series, IX. 1869. Dekker's book was published in 1608.

prominent men sat unconsciously for these portraits indicates the more precise, individualizing quality of Jonson's work.[7]

This individualizing process was so completely carried through that Jonson's debt to Theophrastus would hardly be conspicuous were it not for striking parallelisms here and there in his work. Speeches by Mosca and Sir Politick Would-be have a sound familiar to the Grecian. Jonson's most direct borrowing, however, was not from Theophrastus, but from Libanius, a Greek sophist of Antioch, who flourished in the fourth century after Christ. The humor of Morose in *The Silent Woman* and a number of Volpone's speeches are borrowed directly from a declamation by Libanius.[8] But here again one sees how Jonson individualized the portrait for presentation on the stage. It was through the drama and for the sake of the drama, that the genre had fixed itself on Jonson's attention.

The direct influence of Theophrastus, just noticeable in England in the comedies of Jonson, was due in large measure to Casaubon's edition of the Ἠθικοὶ Χαρακτῆρες, which, with a Latin translation, was published in 1592. The work was then translated into English by John Healey before 1610. Thereafter it was an open book to all English readers. And whereas the earliest character writers do not seem to have copied Theophrastus at all, and Ben Jonson seems to have deflected the Theophrastian technique to suit his own purposes, writers only a little later copied the new model with extreme care, and the character in England soon reached the height of its vogue.

Since Ben Jonson used the character almost exclusively for dramatic purposes, Joseph Hall's *Characters of Virtues and Vices,* published in 1608, may be called the earliest collection of Theophrastian sketches in English. There can be no doubt

[7] See C. E. Gough, *The Life and Characters of Sir Thomas Overbury,* Norwich, 1909, for a brief sketch of other writers of characters.

[8] E. C. Baldwin, *Ben Jonson's Indebtedness to the Greek Character Sketch. Modern Language Notes,* vol. 16, pp. 193-198. See also Professor Baldwin's articles in vols. 18, 19, 26, and 27 of *Publications, Modern Language Association.* The plot of the *Silent Woman* may have been suggested by the *Casina* of Plautus or *Il Marescalco* of Aretino.

regarding the source of his inspiration; for Professor Baldwin has drawn up a convincing list of parallelisms between Hall's work and the Greek's.[9] And in the Preface to his book Hall reminded the reader that ancient philosophers had taught morality by sketching life, and that "it is no shame to learn wit of heathen." Since Theophrastus had gathered his work together as "the profitablest monument that he could leave for a farewell visit to his Grecians," Hall himself hoped that his own effort might "save the labour of exhorting and dissuasion."

Just here where Hall virtually declares his adherence to Theophrastian tradition, he marks his departure from it. Hall's moral purpose is sprung altogether from English soil. In depicting the vices, he is more like the Greek; but then he feels constrained to apologize for seeming "less grave, more satirical." He is too religious to regard the departures from the norm as merely amusing facts of life; the probable judgment of the recording angel troubles him. This moral tendency led Hall to attempt a more subtle analysis of the human heart than he found in his pattern. The Greek was satisfied to disclose what certain types of men would do and say in certain specified situations. Hall, probing deeper, sought to read the mind behind these deeds and words. To an equal degree, also, Hall changed the pattern that was before him. His sketches begin each with a conceit, and his essays are elaborated in a succession of cleverly expressed points that mark him one of the conceited school of his century. In his elaborate, carefully planned sentences, more conscious art is found than appears in the simple, natural prose of Theophrastus.

Yet such sketches as that *Of the Male-content* reveal the extent of Hall's indebtedness. "What he hath, he seeth not, his eyes are so taken up with what he wants; and what he sees, he cares not for, because he cares so much for that which is not. When his friend carues him the best morsell, hee murmures that

[9] *The Relation of the English "Character" to its Greek Prototype. Publications, Modern Language Association,* vol. 18, pp. 412-423.

it is an happy feast wherein each one may cut for himselfe. When a present is sent him, he askes, *Is this all?* and *What no better?* . . . Every blessing hath somewhat to disparage and distaste it: children bring cares, single life is wilde and solatarie, eminence is envious, retirednesse obscure; fasting painfull; satietie vnwieldie, Religion nicely seuere, liberty is lawlesse; wealth burdensome; mediocritie contemptible: Every thing faulteth, either in too much, or too little." All this is taken from the corresponding Greek essay.

This in general is Hall's method. The Covetous Man "grudgeth his neighbour the water of his Well," and "cries out above others of the prodigalitie of our times." If the Vain Glorious Man "have bestowed but a little summe in the glazing, paving, parieting of God's House, you shall finde it in the Church-window." The same fellow "picks his teeth when his stomach is empty, and calls for Phesants at a common Inne." This is exactly the procedure of Theophrastus. Hall, though, molds his sentences and paragraphs more carefully, so that his essays leave the impression of an art too conscious of itself. For example, the True Friend's "affectations are both united and divided: united to him he loveth, divided betwixt another and him selfe; and his one heart is so parted, that whiles hee hath some, his friend hath all." This literary affectation is more apparent in the essays on the vices, where Hall is most entertaining. To the Slothful Man, for instance, "summer is out of his favour for nothing but long dayes that make no haste to their even. He loves still to have the Sun witnesse of his rising, and lies long, more for lothnesse to dresse him, than will to sleepe." Possibly, Hall's censorious attitude toward the vices was characteristic of his age. Life was simple in the time of Theophrastus, and a definite standard of right and wrong prevailed. Life for Hall's countrymen was confused; religion and government were unsettled. Right conduct, too, was undetermined, and eccentricity was allowed and even encouraged. Yet despite all these differences, Hall's book is what it professed to be, a close following of the accepted model.

Only a few years later than these characters, in 1614, appeared Sir Thomas Overbury's *A Wife. . . . Whereunto are added many witty Characters, and conceited Newes, written by himselfe and other learned Gentlemen his friends.* Since Overbury had met his tragic death in the Tower the year before, his work was done almost as early as Hall's, or possibly even earlier. The date of composition can hardly be determined, nor can the authorship of the separate sketches be definitely ascertained. The book first appeared in 1614, with twenty-one characters. Five editions came out in that year. In these later editions, and subsequently, the collection was enlarged by Overbury's followers until eighty characters were included, with no hint as to authorship. This much, however, is certain; the authors, whom the world has since called Overbury, are much more decidedly Theophrastians than was Joseph Hall.

If one may judge from the somewhat cryptic definition of a character that the brilliant young wit drew, Overbury regarded it just as Joseph Hall did. "If I must speake the schoole-masters language," he begins apologetically, mindful of his caustic remarks on pedants, "I will confesse that character comes of this infinitive moode χαράξω, which signifieth to ingrave, or make a deepe impression." The character, then, may be understood as "an imprese, or short embleme; in little comprehending much." This applies directly to the early Greek character. But English writers were to contribute to the type a Euphuistic language of conceit, and, often, a tersely phrased conclusion. So the brilliant courtier adds: "To square out a character by our English levell, it is a picture (reall or personall) quaintly drawne, in various colours, all of them heightned by one shadowing. It is a quicke and soft touch of many strings, all shutting up in one musicall close: it is wits descant on any plaine song."

Conceiving this to be the general aim and method of the character, Sir Thomas Overbury turned to the world he would describe. In part, his subject matter corresponds to that of Theophrastus, for he pictures the dissembler, the pedant, the

melancholy man, and other warpings from the norm or perfect balance of character. But his field is wider than the man's he imitates. He portrays defects in woman's character as well as man's. He considers not only human beings, but trades as well and national types and at least one place or institution, a prison. Thus, although he imitated Theophrastus, Overbury allowed himself the greater freedom that Wilson had sanctioned.

Yet, in spite of the enlarged scope of his sketches, Overbury does not seem to have understood the world any better than other satirists did, and certainly he did not read it so deeply. He made no attempt to interpret mental traits, and he failed to equal the simple realism of Theophrastus. Each of Overbury's sketches is an exercise in clever phrase and terse expression, in the one respect competing with the ingenuity of the metaphysical poets, in the other, with the compactness of Bacon's *Essays*. A typical sentence from *A Puritan* would be: "Ignorance and fat feed are his founders; his nurses, railing, rabbies, and round breeches." Or equally significant for its balance and alliteration is another sentence: "Any thing that the law allowes, but marriage and March beere, hee murmures at; what it disallowes and holds dangerous, makes him a discipline." The author could write finer prose than this, rising to such real cadence as, "she [the milkmaid] makes her hand hard with labour, and her heart soft with pitty; and when winter evenings fall early (sitting at her merry wheele) she sings a defiance to the giddy wheele of fortune." Nevertheless, attention is usually focused on mere cleverness. As each phrase adds its bright conceit to the central idea, the sketch hardly gains any cumulative force, and at best the conclusion is only a last neat stroke, like, "Lastly, his devotion is obstinacy; the only solace of his heart, contradiction; and his main end, hypocrisy."

Overbury's humor is largely dependent on the pun. The tinker, he observed, "marches all over England with his bag and baggage"—the baggage being his "foule, sunne-burnt Queane." The Ordinary Fencer "so much scorns to take blowes

that he never weares cuffes;" while the Devilish Usurer does not "wish any thing to thrive in the country but bee-hives, for they make him wax rich." Or Overbury seeks to arrest attention with a strange conceit. When he notes that an hostler "is a thing that scrubbeth unreasonably his horse, reasonably himselfe," he comes nearer to true humor than when he says that an host "is the kernell of a signe; or the signe is the shell, and mine host is the snaile;" for one is a real incongruity and the other merely a conceit.

Aiming to amuse himself and others with such wit, Overbury never displays the didactic spirit of Hall or even of Theophrastus. That purpose, it is true, hardly makes itself felt on the modern reader in the work of the latter. But the ancient Greek, who regarded the idiosyncrasies dealt with as forms of vice, would probably see a moral end in the work of Theophrastus. He would appear to write both for amusement and reformation. But Overbury, casting ethics to the winds, writes in his more serious moods simply with a satirical end in view. He ridiculed the precisian, the Amsterdam button-maker, and the Jesuit because he loathed them; and he offered his caustic remarks on others because they bored or even amused him. But to shame his victims into being better human beings is far from Overbury's intention. What then could he write of but the virtues, which are so apt to make dullards of us all!

The strictly Theophrastian character sketch reached its most finished state in England in John Earle's *Micro-cosmographie.* It appeared in 1628 with fifty-four characters. Twenty-three were added to this number in 1629, and one more in 1633. Throughout even the final collection, Earle followed his Greek model with close fidelity. Many of the sketches begin with a terse definition and round off with an equally compact, often abrupt, conclusion. There may be in Earle's work fewer direct reminders of Theophrastus' phrasing than in Hall's, and some more notable differences in style. The deeper similarity, however, is there.

Certainly in the *Micro-cosmographie* the basis of judgment on conduct is the Aristotelian mean, or reasonableness. A Drunkard is defined as "one that hath let goe himselfe from the hold and stay of reason, and lyes open to the mercie of all temptations." In the Rash Man, likewise, "every hot fancy or passion is the signall that sets him forward: and his reason comes still in the reare." On the contrary, the Stayed Man is "one that ha's taken order with himselfe, and set a rule to those lawlesnesses within him." Each item in this character is simply a commendation of reason operative in man's general demeanor. The Stayed Man is "coole and temperate in his passions," "firm and standing in his purposes," and "well poys'd in all humours in whom Nature shewed most Geometry." All this is typically Greek in spirit.

Earle, also, like Theophrastus, lists the probable actions of men as they are found in certain specified situations. He shows, for instance, the awkwardness of the Downe-right Scholler in making a salutation, or kissing a mistress, in carving, mounting a horse or the like. Earle, nevertheless, goes further and seeks to interpret the workings of the mind that determine behavior. For example, the Discontented Man suffers from "a selfe-humouring pride, and an accustom'd tendernesse, not to bee crost in his fancy." On him all blows fall heavily, "because they light not first on his expectation." "His composure of himself is a studied carelesnesse with his armes a crosse," and "he is much displeas'd to see men merry." The Younger Brother, it is noted, "is commonly discontented and desperate"; for the Formall Man "the chiefe burden of his braine is the carriage of his body"; the Gallant's "maine ambition is to get a Knight hood." But no clearer example of how Earle passes from the manners of men to their minds can be cited than this sentence on the Church Papist: "if he be forc'd to stay out a Sermon, he puts his hat over his eyes, and frowns out the houre, and when hee comes home, thinkes to make amends for this fault by abusing the Preacher."

This tendency to read the minds of men from their actions brings a depth and truth into Earle's work that cannot be matched in Hall's or Overbury's. Earle portrays the external life of his time, in so far as he knows it intimately. But he reaches also a deeper sort of truth. He would have one see that "a Downe-right Scholler is one that has much learning in the Ore, unwrought and untryde, which time and experience fashions and refines. He is good mettall in the inside, though rough and unscour'd without." Or the Coward, as Earle sees him, seeks to impress others with his boldness; "for the opinion of valour is a good protection to those that dare not use it." Equally discerning is the distinction between acquaintance and friendship: "friendship is a sullener thing, as a contracter and taker up of our affections to some few, and suffers them not loosly to be scatter'd on all men." This is a reading of life, not mere observation. Nor need it be wanting in cleverness. A Pretender To Learning "might with lesse labour cure his ignorance, then hide it"; and the Shop-keeper always insists that "whatsoever hee shewes you, is the best in the Towne, though the worst in his Shop." Tempered to all sorts of moods and experiences, these bits of truth lie scattered through Earle's characters. Consequently, one never feels that he, like Overbury, is sacrificing truth for cleverness of phrase.

In kindliness of heart, also, Earle outranked his predecessors. To offset the satirical portrayal of A Young Rawe Preacher, he added, to the honor of his profession, the flattering picture, A Grave Divine. His very first sketch, A Childe, is full of the same feeling for childhood that is noticeable in Vaughan, Traherne, and Wordsworth, and even hints at the soul's pre-existence in the words: "the elder he growes, hee is a stayer lower from God." Finally, one may remember that Earle, to correct the unpleasant picture of old age given by Overbury, makes these charitable reflections: "You must pardon him if he like his own times better than these," for at his death "he goes away at last too soone whensoever, with all mens sorrow but his owne, and his memory is fresh, when it is twice as old."

Unquestionably, the best of Earle's characters deal with types familiar in the universities of his time—such figures as A College Butler, A meere young Gentleman, A Pretender to Learning, and A Plodding Student. In these sketches one finds close observation, sly humor, and good-heartedness. The Plodding Student's labor "is not great but continuall, and consists much in the sitting up till after Midnight in a rug-gowne, and a Night cap to the vanquishing perhaps of some sixe lines." On other subjects, Earle's knowledge was less direct. He could handle themes like Paul's Walk, for he had had some contact too with London. But he had never lived with Overbury in close touch with the higher life of the city and court. His world was bounded by the university, and his friendships were confined to scholars and divines.

If Earle's *Micro-cosmographie* contains the best English characters of the strictly Theophrastian type, Thomas Fuller's *Holy and Profane State* represents the finest of the later, and considerably altered, characters. Like Earle, he kept his eyes fixed on his subject and made truth his main concern. Consequently, the early character writers' tendency to Euphuism or merely verbal cleverness has disappeared. Fuller seems to be hardly a satirist at all, even in the few pieces of the *Profane State* added to the more complete *Holy State*. He begins with a serious statement, sometimes even a Biblical text, instead of a far-fetched conceit, and holds seriously to his analysis of the chosen type.

Yet it must not be supposed that Fuller's essays are heavy and dull, as Hall's tend to be. They are quaint and humorous in the extreme, without being unnatural or affected. In his predecessors, the conceit was the staple commodity, the bones of the whole frame. Fuller's humor is simply the refracting medium through which truth comes in a strangely altered form. "Some men's heads," he says, "are like the world before God said unto it, Fiat lux"; and again, "watches have been made as light and little as many that wear them make of their time."

This is simply common truth quaintly garbed by a natural humorist.

The same plainness is observable in Fuller's sentence structure. Only occasionally does he affect the terseness of Lord Bacon, whose essays he plainly had in mind in his own essays set in the middle of the volume. Alliteration, balanced clauses, strained emphasis are entirely lacking in Fuller. Like his own General Artist—or man of culture, as we should call him—"he is skillful in rhetoric, which gives a speech color." But he expresses his thought in plain syntax, and the color comes chiefly from the nature of the thought.

Another modification made by Fuller in the conventional character sketch was the resort to example or illustration. The Theophrastians had been content to report the probable doings or sayings of their subjects. Fuller often illustrated his thought from history, as Lord Bacon had done in his *Essays,* and from legend and gossip, as Fuller was wont in all his works to do. Universal biography was at his command for authority. The Younger Brother "cuts out his fortunes with his own sword," as "William the Conqueror, when he first landed his forces in England, burnt all his ships, that despair to returne might make his men the more valiant." More often Fuller draws authority from quasi-history. "What a gift had John Halsebach, Professor at Vienna, in tediousness," he exclaims, "who being to expound the Prophet Esay to his auditors, read twenty-one years on the first chapter, and yet finished it not." Or some more homely illustration served his turn, which Bacon had sparingly employed. Of the modern scholars compared with the ancients, he wrote: "grant them but dwarfs, yet stand they on giants' shoulders, and may see further." Or again, his homely illustration was: "better . . . to lap one's pottage like a dog than to eat it mannerly with a spoon of the devil's giving."

In another way, furthermore, Fuller departed from the established practice. His essays are noticeably longer than those of his forerunners. He therefore often had recourse to a logical division of his subject, after the mode of Bacon, and so gained

the effect of orderliness and continuity at the expense of freedom.

How further the character could be deflected from the strictly Theophrastian tradition is revealed in Geffray Mynshul's *Essayes and Characters of a Prison and Prisoners.*[10] Overbury had already written on the prison, and others had employed similar subjects. It seems, therefore, that Mynshul's book is most significant in that it helps us to distinguish between the character proper and the essay.

Mynshul, of whom little else is known than that he was a member of Gray's Inn and a nephew of Matthew Mainwaring, wrote the pieces comprised in the volume from a London prison. He addressed one dedicatory epistle to his friends of Gray's Inn, "who haue beene loving visitants to me in this inchanted Castle," and another to his uncle, who had "alwayes beene my anchor when I haue been shipwrackt, and many times saued my poore barque when it was ready to split." Throughout most of the volume each subject is treated first in essay form and then in character. The difference is noticeable. The characters are more terse and "witty" and lack historical examples. Such definitive sentences as these, also, come rather from the characters than from the essays: "A prison is a graue to bury men aliue, and a place wherein a man for halfe a yeares experience may learne more law, then hee can at Westminster for an hundred pound"; and, "a prisoner is an impatient patient, lingring vnder the rough hands of a cruell phisitian." To draw the character of a prisoner's friends, Mynshul began: "visitants are men, for the most part, composed all of protesting promises, and little or no performance; they are like your almanacks, which, when they prognosticate faire weather, it is a million to a mite if it proue not contrary: they are like the German clocks, which seldome goe right; their tongues run faster than the clocke on Shroue-Tuesday, the pissing conduit in Cheapside, or an Irish man's paire of heeles when hee runnes on a wager."

[10] London, 1618. Reprinted in 1638 and at Edinburgh, 1821.

The corresponding essay reads in part: "others will promise to lend thee money, but try them before thou haue occasion to vse them, which if they deny thee when thou art at liberty, be then unto them as a shadow." So different are the two forms in the volume that the casual reader need never be at a loss to know on which one he may happen to open the volume.

Just as notable among the new departures in character writing was Donald Lupton's *London and the Countrey Carbonadoed and Quartred into Seuerall Characters*. London in general seemed to him "the great Bee-hive of Christendome," a "gally mophrey of al Sciences, Arts, and Trades." Then he described the tower, as the old royal residence and as the prison, mint, and zoo of his own day. "I had rather bee an honest poore man without it, then otherwise neuer so Great, and iustly in it." Turning to St. Paul's Cathedral, he thinks of the troubled church of his day, when "Puritaines are blowne out of the Church with the loud voice of Organs," since "their zealous Spirits cannot indure the Musicke, nor the multitude of the Surplices." Speaking then of the cathedral's famous middle aisle, he proceeds to Cheapside and Christ's Hospital, whose boys may easily be known "by their Azure liveries and their sable head peeces." Next Lupton added some pictures of London's citizens—fisher women, for example, and several more of country school-teachers and ushers. Possibly his experiences in life had been much what Goldsmith's were to be.

The contrast between the earlier form of English character and the later forms is well illustrated in the work of Nicholas Breton and Samuel Butler. Two influences determined the style of Breton. Dedicating his *Characters upon Essaies Morall and Diuine* to Bacon, he attempted to portray such abstract qualities as wisdom, learning, and peace. On similar themes Bacon had focused attention in his essays. But Breton did not follow his predecessor's model closely. Discarding, in the main, historical illustration, he presented in one detail after another the various aspects of his subject. Usually he began by definition. "Patience" for example, "is a kind of heauenly Tenure, where-

by the Soule is held in possession, and a sweet temper in the Spirit, which restraineth nature from exceeding reason in passion." Then follows a succession of terse statements applicable to the theme. Of death Breton says: "He is the Sextons agent and the Hangmans reuenue, the rich mans dirge and the Mourners merry-day." Occasionally, a longer essay ends in a summary; the essay on valor concludes: "in briefe, let this suffice in her commendation: she strengthened David and conquered Goliah, she ouerthrowes her enemies and conquers her selfe." Clearly, then, Breton is simply applying to Baconian subjects the methods of the English Theophrastians.

Breton's adherence to the traditions of the character sketch in England is still plainer in another little volume, *The Good and the Badde*. Here are gathered portraits of the oft-used types, arranged generally in pairs,—a Worthy King, an Unworthy King, a Worthy Prince, an Unworthy Prince, and so on. Breton confines himself to types and never individualizes. His sentences are short and clear, and he succeeds in giving, without any excessive striving after wit, a keen analysis of each subject. So he succeeds, after all, in sketching here and there bits of real life, and in his defence of merchants and on other social subjects he anticipates the ideas of Addison. Yet, like Overbury, Breton did not aim at clarity altogether; "read what you list and understand what you can. Characters are not every man's construction, though they be writ in our mother tongue."

Compared with Breton's, the sketches of Butler have a decidedly new flavor. Some of them, however, resemble in subject and spirit the best of Earle. "An Antiquary," Butler noted, "is one that has his Being in this Age, but his Life and Conversation is in the Days of old." Again, "a Shopkeeper lives by the Labour of his own Tongue and other Men's Hands." Each of these more orthodox sketches consists purely of an enumeration of certain acts characteristic of the class.

Hence Butler's characters, like those of Theophrastus, picture bits of the city in which he lived. He exhibits the newsmonger, who "takes up upon Trust, and sells as cheap as he

buys," who of all news "loves the bad best, because it is said to come soonest," and who "imports his Narratives from all parts within the Geography of a Diurnal, and eats as well upon the Russ and Polander, as the English and Dutch." From the same London steps the coffee-man, who "keeps a coffee market, where people of all qualities and conditions meet, to trade in foreign drinks and newes, ale, smoak and controversy." Coffee is "the vilest of liquors . . . a kind of drink, as curses are a kind of prayers, that neither nourishes, nor quenches the thirst." With these two, Butler placed the constable, the alderman, the tennis player, the horse-courser, and others known too in the pages of Addison and Steele. Especially the papers on the coffee-house and the news-gatherer seem forerunners of the clever essays of the *Tatler* and the *Spectator*.

In one important respect, however, Butler's attitude toward his age differed from Addison's. The more genial essayist of the eighteenth century avoided politics in his papers and turned to other topics. Butler, living in the heat of political and religious controversy, used the character largely for satire and so gave it its new turn. He ridiculed mercilessly the Quaker and the Anabaptist, and scoffed at the Rebel and the Zealot. Occasionally, he mentioned one of the Puritans by name, so far had the character grown away from the general method with which it began. "An Haranguer," he maliciously remarked, "is one, that is so delighted with the sweet Sound of his own Tongue, that William Prynne will sooner lend an Ear, than he, to any Thing else." Besides this reference to the punishment of Prynne on the pillory, Butler mentioned Oliver Cromwell as an effective haranguer, and in another place spoke favorably of Thomas Hobbes. So the conventicles and the committees, the hypocrites and the saints appear in Butler's *Characters* as definite individuals.

Such satire is just what one would expect of the author of *Hudibras*. In eight separate pieces of his prose, suggestions for the character of Ralph have been detected, and Professor Baldwin's position is well taken that the poem and the *Characters*

should be read together for the light that one throws upon the other.[11] In both Butler aims to uncover the hypocrisy and dishonesty of his foes. It is only natural, therefore, that certain details of *Hudibras* are scattered through his prose, or even that verse like that of the burlesque is used here and there in the *Characters*.

The new employment of the character for political and religious satire at any rate fixed the author's attention on his subject rather than on the details of the portrait. Consequently, Butler seems often to be giving expression to personal opinion, instead of merely sketching some odd type of character. After the typical opening: "A Translator dyes an Author, like an old Stuff, into a new Colour, but can never give it the Beauty and Lustre of the first Tincture," he presents his views on translation as well as on the workman. To an even greater extent the picture of a Small Poet is a succession of adverse critical judgments on the poetasters of the age. This alteration in the fashion of the characters was not due primarily to the choice of new subject matter. On a Modern Critic Butler wrote much in the manner of Theophrastus, simply catching his subject, as it were, in one characteristic attitude after another. The change indicates rather that clever men were no longer satisfied to display their wit and verbal dexterity in character writing, but would follow some more useful end.

Samuel Butler's *Characters,* therefore, more nearly resemble political arguments than portraits. *A Republican,* it seems, was written after the death of Cromwell, while the Puritans were vainly endeavoring to establish firmly the Commonwealth. Butler saw the futility of their counsels. The republican, he declared, "builds Governments in the Air, and shapes them with his Fancy, as Men do Figures in the Clouds." But "while he is modelling of Governments, he forgets that no Government was ever made by Model." Men who would so found Utopias and Oceanas disregard the truth that "as some Trees thrive best in

[11] *A Suggestion for a New Edition of Butler's Hudibras. Publications, Modern Language Association,* vol. 26, pp. 528-548.

one Soil, some in another; so do Governments." Hence "Democracy is but the Effect of a crazy Brain; 'tis like the Intelligible World, where the Models and Ideas of all Things are, but no Things," and these state-botchers, as the satirist calls them, continue to "mold Governments, as Children do Dirt-Pyes, only to busy and please themselves." This same theory of state-craft is further elaborated in sketches of the Modern Politician and the Hypocritical Nonconformist. That they leave with the reader a stock of ideas, rather than a picture, is evidence of the modified plan and purpose of the character.

This hasty survey of the chief collections of characters published in the seventeenth century gives no adequate idea of the widespread popularity of the genre in those days. Besides these collections, single sketches or groups of sketches appeared on every hand. No one has ever gathered all. Of the freshness and variety, however, of the genre, one must speak with less confidence; for, as time went on, the problem of keeping the character distinctive and yet fresh proved increasingly difficult. Fortunately, as this essay has aimed to show, the English writers from the beginning allowed themselves a greater latitude of subject than Theophrastus had marked out. In this respect, Donald Lupton and Geffray Mynshul, whose characters followed soon in the wake of Overbury's, exercised a marked influence, one with his observant pictures of London, which had only to be retouched by Addison and Steele, the other with his sympathetic pictures of the London jail, which Johnson, Goldsmith, and others of the next century could use if they would. Next, the character was modified to serve as a vehicle for ideas, as Butler's were. Some variety, therefore, was found for the almost numberless character sketches.

Of this no more than a brief indication can be given here. The clever court poet, John Cleveland, published several satirical sketches, one of them on the Puritan newspapers, in which metaphysical conceits run riot. Richard Flecknoe wrote his *Fifty-five Enigmatical Characters,* and Wye Saltonstall his *Picturæ Loquentes, or Pictures drawn forth in Characters.*

Richard Brathwaite, better known for his *English Gentleman,* contributed his little, in 1631, in *Whimzies; or, a New Cast of Characters.* Then Owen Feltham, moralist and familiar letter writer, added *A Brief Character of the Low Countries,* in 1669. Even John Milton drew up his *Character of the Long Parliament.* One of the most interesting of these lesser collections is a little volume, written by John Stephens and published as early as 1615, *Essayes and Characters Ironicall and Instructive.* The book contains four satires written in the rimed couplet—that itself worth remembering by a student of early seventeenth-century satire. Then, after several essays in prose, come the characters themselves. One of them gives Stephens' sharp comments on the poetaster. In another, he adds his criticism of the Common Player. Overbury had just written in defence of the actor's calling. Here Stephens expressed the usual Puritan objections to the players and the stage. Although he is ready to admit that some players, not "ordinary," "deserve a wise mans commendation," he generally censured the actor and observed that "the Statute hath done wisely to acknowledge him a Rogue errant, for his chief essence is A daily Countefeit."[12] So the more important of such characters possess some touch of individuality. But there is much sameness in them, and a more extended enumeration would hardly pay.[13]

The character sketch, therefore, cannot be regarded as an ephemeral literary fad. The truth is that the character grew directly from a number of diverse influences that happened to converge just then on the English mind. There was first the influence given by Casaubon's translation of Theophrastus. At the same time, also, Bacon set the pattern for the essay and taught English writers what might be accomplished by packing thought in terse, compactly formed sentences. The character

[12] Sir John Davies, in 1602, contributed to Davison's *Poetical Rhapsody* a series of six-line stanzas, each poem virtually a character drawn by the subject himself.

[13] Full bibliographies have been published by Bliss, in his edition of the *Micro-cosmographie* and by Professor Baldwin in *Publications of the Modern Language Association,* vol. 19, pp. 104-114.

writers more or less openly acknowledged both influences. Fuller inserted a number of Baconian essays between the two parts of his *Holy and Profane State,* while Nicholas Breton dedicated one of his works to his great forerunner. Even more obvious was the debt to Theophrastus. And where no such debt is acknowledged, it is plain that our character writers could never have written as they did and on what they did had it not been for the example of Bacon and Theophrastus, each one, be it noted, a great scientist of his day.

Besides these external influences, certain inner, or psychological, conditions operated in the same direction. It is not strange that the character flourished both in ancient Greece and England immediately after the great creative literary period. There came first two periods of wonderful dramatic production, when Sophocles and Shakespeare probed life and the human heart deeply. The Elizabethans were interested in fundamental, unchanging aspects of human nature. Then the Jacobean playwrights, like the authors of the New Comedy in Greece, turned from these broader problems to scrutinize the external, changing aspects of life. To this they were encouraged by the proudly displayed eccentricities of the age and by the Puritan habit of introspection. Hence the dress, the habits of speech, the ways and whims of men appeared in literature. Ben Jonson's comedies of humor and the numerous plays on city life furnished ample material for the brief studies of the characters. They had simply to take from comedy a certain odd character, to exhibit as the master of puppets might have done. The character sketch is merely a report of what some person might be represented as doing or saying on the stage. It is really significant, then, that England's great realistic playwright should have been the first to introduce the Theophrastian sketch in London.

The popularity of the character sketch in England can be amply accounted for in these ways. Naturally, it ran its course and, as an independent form, ceased to be. Nevertheless, because it had been once so conspicuous a part of a nation's

literature, the character sketch simply disintegrated, and its component parts were assimilated in newer forms of literature. So the character lived on in other guise. Comedies of the Restoration period show very plainly traces of its assimilation. Other traces are observable in the periodical essay. A country gentleman like Sir Roger de Coverly, for example, is directly descended from Overbury's and Earle's squires. Even in the bitter political satire of the last years of the century the spirit of the character was still operative. Dryden's scathing portrait of Zimri in *Absalom and Achitophel* as well as parts of *Mac Flecknoe,* and Pope's picture of Addison as Atticus, as well as his description of a true critic in the *Essay on Criticism,* all are further survivals of the character. Some of the *Essays of Elia* go back to the same source. The character, therefore, still lives.

In this process of change and development, the character sketch experienced an interesting migration. The original impulse was transmitted from Greece of the fourth century to England of the sixteenth. Then Hall's characters were soon translated into French, and in the hands of La Bruyère and others were further modified. This French type, with its greater precision and individuality in portraiture as well as its habit of reflection, was then brought back to England, to influence Steele and Addison and other essayists in London. They, in turn, contributed to the growth of the novel.

To-day, however, one looks back to the character books little realizing how important they were in their time, or how greatly they have influenced other literary forms. All men, in those days, of any literary pretension tried their skill at character writing, just as the Elizabethan gentleman trifled with the sonnet. Courtiers like Overbury would not be expected to have a more serious use for the employment of their pens. Hall and Earle, when they engaged in the pastime, had not yet undertaken their serious callings. But men of all temperaments in the most varied walks of life wrote characters. A serious educator like John Cleland drew up in parallel columns in the *Institution*

of a Nobleman contrasting pictures of wisdom and ignorance, and of the true friend and the flatterer. Satirists like John Cleveland and Butler; moralists like Richard Brathwaite at the end of the *English Gentleman* and the *English Gentlewoman;* churchmen like George Herbert, whose *Country Parson* is simply a character in extenso; and idle men of the world, all contributed something to building up the type. The character had something to offer to all, and hundreds engaged in the pastime in addition to these whose works are yet remembered.

EMBLEM BOOKS

JUST four hundred years ago the celebrated Italian jurist, Andrea Alciati, compiled the first volume of emblems. As character writing was begun by Theophrastus, the most eminent natural scientist of his day, so the emblem book was devised by a scholar widely known for his treatises on law. Each type, therefore, seems to owe its origin to accident or the leisure interests of its first promoter, and each was doubtless influenced in precision and formality by the profound learning of its author. Although the *Emblematum Libellus* may have been published at Milan in 1522, no edition earlier than 1531 has been preserved. In its earliest form it contained only ninety-seven emblems. But as it appeared again and again in almost countless new editions, it was added to and enlarged until, after Claude Mignault had furnished his learned and ample commentaries for the edition of 1573, it embraced almost one thousand pages. The earliest English translation, of King James' reign, was never sent to press. But it would be futile to list the separate versions that appeared all over Europe. There were in all over one hundred forty editions published during the sixteenth century. Alciati's little volume, therefore, which established the great vogue of the emblem, exerted an almost unparalleled influence on the literature of the time.[1]

An emblem, briefly, is a combination of motto, picture, and short poem used collectively to expound some moral or ethical truth. One of Alciati's four-line poems, for example, develops the moral, "Pietas filiorum in parentis"; its picture shows

[1] G. R. Redgrave, *Emblems and Impresas. Bibliophile*, 3, pp. 65-70, 141-145. 1909. The first four editions of Alciati's emblems were published in facsimile by the Holbein Society in 1870 and 1871.

Aeneas carrying Anchises out of burning Troy on his shoulders. Again, the artist drew an oak tree to accompany the lines:

> Grata Ioui est quercus, qui nos servatque fouetque,
> Seruanti ciuem querna corona datur.

Another emblem presents the text, "Ex litterarum studiis immortalitatem acquiri." And to expose the folly of avarice, the artist engraved the picture of Tantalus, while Alciati furnished the moral:

> Heu miser in mediis sitiens stat Tantalus vndis,
> Et poma esuriens proxima habere nequit.
> Nomine mutato de te id dicetur auare,
> Qui, quasi non habeas, non frueris quod habes.

Many of Alciati's poems are merely couplets or quatrains; but the material is varied, and the method remains unchanged.

The little volumes that immediately followed Alciati's arouse the reader's interest for their quaintness and charm. One of the most attractive was Giles Corrozet's *Hecatongraphie; c'est à dire les descriptions de cent figures & hystoires*.[2] The beautiful little engravings, which are hardly more than two inches in size, are each set in a finely designed, ornamental border. Corrozet's subjects are drawn from history, fables, proverbs, and other similar sources. The first emblem, for example, is entitled, "Parler peu & venir au poinct." This is illustrated by the picture of a man shooting at a target with a crossbow. Beneath the engraving stands the poem:

> Celluy qui le mieulx tirera
> Droict au but, & plus pres du blanc,
> Son coup fera estimé franc,
> Et la louenge en recepvra.

On the opposite page a longer didactic poem shows the full application of the lesson taught. Another engraving, for the subject "Noblesse de Science," presents a warrior standing fully armed beside a scholar who is seated at a tall, narrow

[2] Paris, 1540. I have used the edition of 1543.

desk, much like a reading desk. Their identity is then disclosed by the poet:

> Achilles grand honneur merite
> Pour sa prouesse redoubtable;
> Homere acquiert honneur semblable,
> Pour l'hystoire qu' il a escripte,

and the moral is drawn as before.

Another early volume, the *Emblemata*[3] of Hadrian Junius, contains only fifty-eight emblems. One, entitled "Prouidentia," represents a crocodile on a river bank, while the subjoined poem explains the creature's habits thus:

> Quò sacer excurret Nilus in arua,
> Praescius, alluuie libera ponit
> Oua, monens meritò nos Crocodilus
> Quae fata immineant antè videre.

Another picture of a group of boys blowing soap bubbles, is explained by its motto, "Cuncta complecti velle, stultum," by a second motto set in the engraving, "Et tutto abbraccio et nulla stringo," and by the customary verse. Unlike Corrozet, Junius reserved his homilies, which were written in prose, for a special section that occupies the latter half of the book.

The French reformer, Theodore Beza, was the compiler of still another volume of early emblems. Of his forty-three pieces, some are extremely simple; the first is only a plain circle, and the second, a circle divided into quadrants. Another explains the symbolism of the lamb. Still another pictures two crocodiles, one in hot pursuit of a man, the other seeking safety from the upraised club of his pursuer. The lesson is humorous for its naïveté:

> Niliacus quales serpens fugientibus instat,
> Instantes fugiens quamlibet antè ferox.
> Sic vetus ille Draco, saeuus mortalibus hostis,
> Te reprimente fugit, te fugiente premit.[4]

[3] Amsterdam, 1565.
[4] *Poëmata Varia.* Geneva, 1597 (first edition, 1581).

So, for the expounding of moral truth, this partnership was formed between poetry, one of the oldest of the arts, and engraving, then one of the newest arts. Great scholars and noted poets contributed the verses, and the best engravers, whether on wood or copper, furnished the plates. The best specimens of woodcuts are to be found in the *Emblemata* of Sambucus, published in 1564. De Bry stands as the best of the engravers on copper. He cut the plates in 1593 for Boissard's *Emblematum Liber,* which contains fifty-one pieces, and those for the *Emblemata Saecularia,* that appeared in 1611. Some of the volumes were cheaply made; others are remarkably fine. In size they ranged from the smallest duodecimo to large octavo. In those varied forms they circulated all over Europe, appealing to cultured and uncultured alike. It has been estimated that well over seven hundred volumes appeared before the death of Shakespeare, and of course many more appeared after 1616. The influence that they exerted can never be estimated.

The main justification of emblem literature, in the minds of its promoters, was the potency of its appeal. Camerarius or his editor might allege the antiquity of emblems, or might assert that Christ himself, in lessons drawn from the lilies of the fields and the birds, had sanctioned its use. But more than all this, emblem writers saw that they had found a really popular and helpful method of instruction.[5] Bacon tersely expressed the justification in these words: "Emblems reduce intellectual conceptions to sensible images, and that which is sensible more forcibly strikes the memory and is more easily imprinted on it than that which is intellectual."[6] Samuel Daniel offered the same argument: "To represent unto the sence of sight the forme or figure of any thing, is more natural in act, & more common to al creatures then is hearing." Hence, Daniel says, "even litle children as soone as they can use their hands at

[5] *Symbolorum et Emblematum Centuriae Tres.* Norembergiae, 1605. The parts dated 1590, 1596, 1604. See preface by Camerarius or his editor.

[6] *De Augmentis Scientiarum,* Book 5, chap. 5.

libertie, goe with a Cole to the wall, indevoring to drawe the forme of this thing or that."[7] The soundness of these contentions was abundantly proved by the popularity of these books as a class.

By this time the meaning of the word emblem, as it was used in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, must be clear. Emblemata were metal ornaments, such as figures of men and animals, wrought in relief and attached to the surface of bowls, vases, and cups. The word was derived from the Greek ἐμβάλλειν. Hence any figure, engraved or drawn, or, in fact, any picture signifying more than is actually delineated, was called an emblem. All the early writers on the subject, after calling attention to the derivation of the word, allow it this wider application. Luca Contile, for example, defined an emblem as "un componimento di figura, e di motto rappresentante virtuoso, e magnanimo disegno." Menestrier's idea was the same—"une espece d'enseignement mis en image, pour regler la conduite des hommes."[8] So Claude Mignault simply followed the generally accepted notion when he justified the application of the word, emblem, to the poems and pictures of Alciati.[9] The emblem, therefore, was a combination of motto and picture, a verse briefly explaining the picture, and, often, a longer explanation in verse or prose.

It proved much easier to define the term in this general way than to distinguish the emblems from other kindred forms. The simple *mot,* or *poesie,* is plainly recognizable, for it consisted of the simplest sort of text applied by some particular person in a special sense. The motto borne by Chaucer's Nun, "Amor vincit omnia," belonged to this class. Just as easily the *livrees,* as Samuel Daniel called them, and *insignes* can be kept distinct; the one designated a particularity in dress that marked

[7] *The Worthy Tract of Paulus Jovius.* "To the Friendly Reader."

[8] Luca Contile, *Ragionamento . . . sopra la Proprietà delle Imprese.* Pavia, 1574. Quoted from G. Ferro, *Teatro d' Imprese.* Venetia, 1623, p. 5. C. F. Menestrier, *L'Art des Emblèmes.* Paris, 1584.

[9] *Emblemata,* 1608. "Syntagma de Symbolis," pp. 46-47.

a certain family or indicated darkly the lady that the wearer secretly served, while the other was displayed on banners and helmets.[10] But the *imprese,* the *imagini,* and even the armorial devices could not be so exactly differentiated from the *emblemi.* It was a real problem, therefore, that one of the emblematists presented in an introductory poem, beginning:

> Quid symbolum sit, ne amplius
> Roges, breuissime, ut potest,
> Conabimur nunc edere.[11]

The armorial design alone offers an almost limitless subject for study. Briefly, heraldry may be defined as the science of symbols. These symbols depend, for their significance, on three criteria: the object represented, the posture in the design of that object, and the tincture or coloring, which may be either natural or conventional. The meaning of the device is partly revealed in an accompanying motto. Simple though it may seem, the science of heraldry is bound by many ties to the art and literature of ancient times.[12]

In Italy, especially, beautifully engraved books relating to heraldry were common. Ruscelli's *Le Imprese Illustri,* printed in Venice in 1566, was one of the finest. Twenty years later another collection, bearing the same title, was published by Camilli. Each reproduces the arms of various noble families and adds a biographical gloss. This seems quite remote from the emblem books. But the treatises on heraldry sometimes approached the other type. For example, in De Boot's *Symbola Varia* each plate reproduces the arms of two families and then supplements the biographical sketch with a plain, moral lesson. The motto of one family was "Ad meliora," and the device represented a horse nibbling grass. A horse, it is then said,

[10] Samuel Daniel, *The Worthy Tract of Paulus Jovius.* London, 1585. "To the Friendly Reader."

[11] A. Bocchi, *Symbolicarum Quaestionum . . . Libri Quinque.* 1555.

[12] J. Vinycomb, *Fictitious and Symbolic Creatures in Art.* London, 1906.

always moves forward when it eats, expecting better pasture ahead. So man should press on, "nam in mundanis rebus satietas nulla, neque finis desiderii est."[13] Such in general were the homilies of the emblematists.

The relation between the *imprese,* or devices, and the emblems was even closer. The *impresa,* Daniel explained, combined a design and a *mot* in such wise as to disclose the bearer's purpose. They resembled the heraldic device, therefore, but were not so personally or fixedly attached to the bearer. *Imprese* were often used for diversion at royal entertainments. Several noblemen in Marlowe's play explain their devices to King Edward. Castiglione mentions some that were shown at Urbino, and Sir Henry Wotton describes two others. One, a small pearl, bore the motto, "Solo candore valeo"; the other, a sun casting its rays on a pillar, was inscribed "Splendente refulget."[14] Of the nature of *imprese,* also, were the nine designs composed by Sir Thomas More for hangings in his father's house, on such themes as Death, Time, and Eternity.[15]

The combination of such designs and the verses accompanying them closely resembled the emblems. Hence critics were forced to distinguish between the two types. The *impresa* was devised "per diletto di vista, e di significati," Ferro believed. It should preserve a proper balance, Jovius argued, between the picture, or body, of the piece, and the verse, or soul. It should also be neither too obvious nor too mystifying; pictorially its effect should be striking; its motto should be expressed in some foreign language; and it should avoid the portrayal of the human figure. Furthermore, according to the theory of Ruscelli, the picture expresses one part of the meaning of the *impresa,* the motto another, and neither is complete in itself. *Imprese,* also, are serviceable only to particular persons; or, as Ferro expressed it, they apply a particular conceit to a special person,

[13] *Symbola Varia.* Amsterdam, 1686, p. 264.
[14] *The Book of the Courtier,* 1, section 5. Wotton's *Life and Letters,* 2, p. 17.
[15] H. Green, *Shakespeare and the Emblem Writers,* p. 120.

rather than express a general truth. *Imprese,* finally, are restricted in length of motto.[16]

In many respects the *impresa,* then, differed from the emblem. In the pictures of the latter, the human form was often used. The pictures and poems, also, of the emblems were independent, and either was comprehensible without the other. Hence in England, and elsewhere, the verses were often published without the cuts as "naked emblems." In all respects the meaning of the emblem was more plain than that of the *impresa.* The emblematist worked with more detail and allowed himself more explanation. He dealt with a universally applicable truth; or, as Ferro expressed it, the *imprese* applied a particular conceit to a special person, and an emblem, a general truth for all mankind. Naturally, these exact distinctions were not always observed. Emblematists were fond of drawing a lesson from the remora, that little fish that was supposed to retard or direct the course of a ship; but this same subject appears in Ferro's collection of *imprese.* Possibly, most modern readers will agree with Ferro that too much was commonly made of these distinctions, and perhaps censure him for writing several hundred pages on the topic himself.

The *imagini,* as they were called, more nearly resembled the *imprese* than the emblems. This new form can best be explained by reference to Cesar Ripa's *Iconologia.*[17] This large volume of over seven hundred pages contains graphic representations of the virtues and vices, the human passions, the arts and sciences, and the provinces and rivers of Italy. The material is arranged alphabetically; Abondanza is the subject of the first design, Academia, of the second, and so on. Underneath

[16] G. Ferro, *Teatro d' Imprese,* pp. 23, 246, 263. P. Jovius, *Ragionamento . . . sopra i Motti e Disegni d' Arme e d' Amore.* Milan, 1883, pp. 4-6. Luca Contile, *Ragionamento . . . sopra la Proprietà delle Imprese.* Pavia, 1574. J. Ruscelli, *Le Imprese Illustri.* Venice, 1584, pp. 12-14. The tract by Jovius was translated by Daniel. See also two articles by G. R. Redgrave, *Daniel and the Emblem Literature. Transactions, Bibliographical Society,* 11, pp. 39-58. 1912, and *Emblems and Impresas. Bibliophile,* 3, pp. 65-70, 141-145. 1909.

[17] *Della Novissima Iconologia di Cesare Ripa.* Padova, 1630. First printed in 1593.

each picture is a full description of the significance of all details of the drawing. Education, for example, is represented as a matron, with well-formed breasts, richly dressed and seated in a patch of light from heaven. She holds in one hand a rod, and her other hand rests on a branch that is fixed in the ground. Before her stands a boy reading a book. In the same fashion, Europa, dressed in queenly robes and crowned, is seated between two large cornucopias filled with fruits of all kinds. In her right hand she holds a small temple, and with her left she points to a pile of crowns and sceptres lying on the ground. On her left stands a war horse and a little owl, perched on a heap of pens and tablets and musical instruments. Then comes the exposition. The rich robe of many colors represents the geographical diversity of Europe; the crown, its supremacy; the overflowing cornucopias, its fertility; the temple, its adherence to the one true religion; and the other details, the might of its princes and the learning of its scholars.

In one of the prefaces, the reader is told how Ripa gathered his material from ancient books and monuments, from his friends, and from his own conceits. In a second preface, the writer expressed the belief that his encyclopedic work would be serviceable to orators, poets, preachers, and persons of all stations of life. He then went on to explain the principles that underlie the framing of these *imagini*. He drew the same distinctions as other theorists did. The *imagini* in their symbolism closely resemble the devices of heraldry; *imprese* expound a slight thought by means of a simple picture and a few well chosen words; *emblemi* present a larger idea by means of a more detailed picture and a longer exposition. Ripa's own book illustrates his theory. No motto other than the dictionary title accompanies the designs; the pictures are allegorical rather than illustrative; and the accompanying text, in Italian prose, is purely exposition of that symbolism and never a story, as in the emblem books. Ripa's *imagini* thus used the human form symbolically to depict the virtues or vices or matters closely related to them; and his dictionary, therefore, is a recipe-book

for designers and engravers. So the *Iconologia* bridges the gap that separates the emblematic designs of heraldry from the pictorial representations of the literary emblem books. Unlike the *imprese,* which were designed mainly for courtly entertainment, and the *imagini,* which appealed chiefly to the cultured, the emblems proper were addressed to persons of all kinds, and the little volumes containing them were scattered broadcast over Europe.[18]

The clearest exposition of the nature of the emblem was given by Menestrier. It is, in his words, "une espece d'enseignement mis en image, pour regler la conduite des hommes." Its essential parts are always a pleasing picture for the eye and instruction for the spirit; "il aura toujours ces deux parties de la Peinture & du sens mystique." The pictures may be either representations of things in nature or symbolical designs of such abstractions as Abundance with her cornucopia, or poetical representations of virtues and vices and the human passions. The pictures are explained by the accompanying text. In some cases, only a title is given; in other cases, a brief sentence or phrase applicable to the action is used; in still other cases, a short, epigrammatic poem is then added, often with a longer explanatory poem to enforce the moral. This enforcement of the lesson, Menestrier believed, is more necessary for emblems dealing with natural objects than for those dealing with symbolical or poetical concepts, for these are often plain in themselves through the presence of conventional details. The range of subject for the emblems is almost unlimited—the Bible, history, fables, proverbs, poetic fancies, and the like. Some are moral in their theme, others are political, others are either satirical, doctrinal, heroical, natural, chemical, or emotional. Of the two large classes, the poetical or symbolical emblems

[18] A later book that contained features of several different types was G. F. Le Jay's *Le Triomphe de la Religion sous Louis le Grand.* Paris, 1677. The devices and inscriptions that it contains were first executed to be hung in a hall in which a panegyric on the king was to be delivered. Le Jay afterwards described the inscriptions in Latin verse, which was soon translated into French, and Corneille executed the engravings.

exact of their designer greater ingenuity and invention than do the natural emblems. In either case, however, the accompanying verse should not exceed fourteen or sixteen lines; for, as Menestrier sagely remarked, "comme ces vers sont d'instruction, ils ne demandent pas de longues saillies." Hence, in the French language the sonnet, the madrigal, and the epigram have proved themselves the fittest forms. But in all emblems, according to Menestrier, there is the picture, which may be called the "matière"; the moral lesson, or "forme"; and the rule of conduct, or "fin."[19]

These French and Italian treatises on emblem literature were carried to England before the art had really been developed there. Daniel's translation of the tract of Jovius has already been mentioned. In 1588 another wide-awake London author, Abraham Fraunce, wrote his little Latin treatise, *Insignium, Armorum, Emblematum, Hieroglyphicorum, et Symbolorum . . . Explicatio.* His theory is taken directly from Jovius, Contile, and Ruscelli. Later, other treatises in the same field appeared. As early as 1592 Wyrley issued *The True Use of Armorie,* the more exact nature of which is plain from the title. In 1646 Thomas Blount published *The Art of Making Devises,* which was a direct translation from the French of Henry Estienne. To the same group should be added the *Sphere of Gentry,* the work, probably, of Edward Waterhouse. In no one of these critical treatises, however, was anything of importance added to modify the theories that had been developed on the Continent.

Although the *Emblematum Libellus* of Alciati may be called the first book of its kind in Europe, the idea on which it rested was not altogether new. The earliest known use of picture for the enforcement of moral truth has been called in recent time, both here and in England, The Tablet of Cebes. This painting was designed to illustrate a little moral treatise, written possibly by that Cebes, a pupil of Socrates in the fourth century,

[19] *L'Art des Emblèmes,* pp. 5, 207, 33-35, 86-159, 237, 15.

whom Plato and Xenophon mention. The work could not have been composed later than the year 160 of our era; for Tertullian and Lucian plainly allude to it. But wherever it was written, and by whom, *The Tablet of Cebes* has always exercised a potent charm over its readers. As a late editor, with possibly some exaggeration, has observed: "Described by Lucian, translated into Latin verse by a relative of Tertullian, praised by Gronovius as the book which he ever kept before his eyes or upon his person, commended by Milton, and utilized by Bunyan, the *Tabula* needs no other testimony to its worth than that already furnished by its numerous friends, its multiplied editions and translations, and the beauty and purity of its philosophy."[20]

A number of strangers, Cebes tells us, gather before a picture that has been placed as a votive offering in some temple of Kronos, left unnamed for greater effectiveness of the allegory. An aged man who comes upon the wondering beholders there expounds the meaning of the design in this way. Its three concentric circles separated by high walls represent the scope of man's life. At the gateway leading to the first circle, holding a chart in his hands and seeking to guide the crowd that presses forward for entrance, stands an old man, the Daimon of each human being. But Deceit, by her magic potions, Ignorance and Error, misleads the entrants, who in the outer circle fall under the sway of Opinions, Desires, and Enjoyments. Fortune, also, is there to betray them; and Incontinence, Profligacy, Greed, and Flattery, to destroy. So the poor wayfarers, forced by their crimes to Retribution, Sorrow, Anguish, Lament, and Despair, languish at last in the House of Woe.[21]

[20] *Cebes' Tablet.* R. Parsons, ed. Boston, 1904. One English reprint was entitled, *The Life and Philosophy of Epictetus, with the Emblem of Human Life by Cebes, rendered into English by John Davies of Kidwelly.* Milton's reference is in the *Tractate on Education.*

[21] Two seventeenth-century designs are reproduced by H. Green in *Shakespeare and the Emblem Writers.* London, 1870.

From that place of torture, the sinners are rescued by Repentance, who offers new counsel that leads either to True Learning or False Learning. As the latter gains the upper hand, again the travelers in the second inclosure suffer for their folly. Finally, they reach the steep ascent leading to the third, or innermost, circle, where True Learning is to be found. At the gate the toil-worn aspirants are refreshed with a purifying drink and are welcomed by Knowledge, Courage, Righteousness, and other virtues. There true happiness is won.

Such is the philosophy of life that Cebes would expound. It is hardly a Pilgrim's Progress, for the goal that the wayfarers strive for is to be attained in this world and not in another. Life is good, Cebes believes, if it be nobly spent, and true happiness comes from virtue, or perfect health of soul.

Between *The Tablet of Cebes* and the emblem books of the sixteenth century intervened many other such representations of moral truth. All were partial in scope; for the old Greek trust in the perfect health and balance of man's faculties had disappeared. Cebes might be somewhat troubled that medieval teachers never attempted to portray in one work the whole significance of spiritual life, and, instead, handled it piecemeal as it is revealed in conduct or specific habits of thought. The general spirit of the age, however, favored the resort to picture for moral instruction. Allegory was universal throughout Europe. In France, furthermore, during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, *tableaux vivants* accompanied, or took the place of, homiletic teaching. And of course the morality plays in all European countries responded to the same ideas; for in them picture and exposition were merely transmuted into action and dialogue.

One such link between *The Tablet of Cebes* and the emblem books was the medieval representation of the Dance of Death. Originally, it was only a dumb show or tableau used to illustrate and drive home the warnings of the preacher. From that natural beginning, as early as the fourteenth century, sprang the literary and graphic presentation of the theme. Death was

represented summoning King and Bishop, Courtier and Scholar, Merchant and Peasant to judgment. The story was told by poets and preachers; it was painted on the walls and windows of churches, in illuminated service books, and, throughout Switzerland, even on the bridges and the façades of private houses; it was used as the text of the moral plays. Then at last it was printed in book form, in 1538, under the title, *Les Simulachres & Historiees faces de la Mort.*[22] This volume in one respect differed from the emblem books. Its theme was single—a succession of pictures and paragraphs illustrative of the warning, "Be ye therefore ready, also, for the Son of man cometh at an hour when ye think not." The later emblem books contained mottoes, pictures, and poems bearing on a great number of moral and ethical truths. Yet the universal acceptance of the allegory of the Dance of Death prepared the way in part for the wide diffusion of emblems in the age to come.

Another work that helped to prepare readers for the emblems of the Renaissance was Sebastian Brandt's *Narrenschiff*. Published first at Basle in 1494, the satire was freely adapted, or rather done anew, in Latin by Jacob Locher in 1497, and became at once, either in the *Stultifera Nauis,* or in French, Dutch, or English translations, the common property of European nations. Two English versions appeared in 1509, one by Henry Watson, the other by Alexander Barclay.

The idea of a ship bound for Narragonia, or Fool's Land, heavily freighted with fools of every description was suggested to Brandt, it has been said, by the floats used often in the popular carnival processions in German cities. At all events, without any attempt at order, he added to his voyagers first one, then another, representative of the class. Each poem or sketch is accompanied by a woodcut, humorously depicting the victim of the satire. For example, the bookish fool is described in these words:

[22] É. Mâle, *L'Art Religieux de la Fin du Moyen Age.* Paris, 1908, pp. 390-393. W. Seelman, *Die Toten Taenze des Mittelalters.* Leipzig, 1893, pp. 11-21.

Den vordanz hat man mir gelan,
Dan ich on nutz vil Bücher han,
Die ich nit lis und nit verstan.

In the accompanying engraving we see an old pedant, with heavy horn spectacles on his nose, a sleeping cap on his head, and a fool's cap pushed back over his shoulders, seated before a desk loaded with books, from one of which he is driving the flies with a large brush. These woodcuts, for which Brandt himself supplied the designs, greatly enhance the humor of the rather crude rhymes. There are in all one hundred thirteen separate satires, representing vividly the follies and abuses that he saw in the world about him.

In translating the *Narrenschiff,* Barclay held true to the satirical and moral purpose of the original. His poems and pictures were designed "to redres the errours and vyces of this our royalme of Englande." Barclay, therefore, had much to say of abuses in church and state. In one piece, advocating the application of principles of wisdom and justice to government, he condemned the corruption of public officials. Again, he denounced the extortion of knights and pleaded for the oppressed. His criticism of his own profession, the clergy, was just as unsparing. Nor did the common people escape censure; for, with the rest, the "crafty men or laborers" were called on to embark, and quickly.

The speciall vyce comon amonge them all
Is that eche seruaunt fayne wolde a mayster be
Yet in his craft he knoweth nought atall
But is a Fole therein.

Yet the author does not appear to be a violent reformer. He loyally praised King Henry and noticed the faults of the clergy only to lament the decay of the true Catholic faith.

Often, however, Barclay's satire is moral rather than social or political. In his crew are to be found card players and dicers, who enjoy "gamys prohybyte by the lawe"; the improvident, who lay up nothing for the winter of their lives; tale-bearers,

blasphemers, and all those unconcerned at the approach of death. Such were the lessons most commonly taught in the emblem books. And even on other themes Barclay's procedure was of influence. To exhibit the wrongs of injustice or the dignity of honest poverty, he turned for authority to Roman history, as the essayists, character writers, and emblematists of later time did; and in the envoy closing each poem Barclay gave his plain admonition. Had he not been so fond of this moralizing, his work might be of greater interest. His style, finally, is plain and direct, and his spirit earnest. But he exerted an influence more specific than all this on the emblem writers. Sambucus took from the *Narrenschiff* his lessons on drunkenness and gambling and his moralizing on the fowlers' methods of decoying birds.[23] Faerno borrowed from the same source the anecdote of the condemned thief who bit off his mother's nose as he rode to the gallows, because she had failed to train him rightly. In short, the *Narrenschiff* proved an important contribution to that branch of didactic literature that depends on the joint use of homily and picture. The engraver had found a place among the reformers of his day.

Fables, also, from which moral lessons might so easily be drawn, were furnished with illustrations even in very old manuscripts. One of the oldest collections, the *Fables of Bidpai,* contains stories told by an eastern sage to his king of experiences met with by Buddha during one or another of his earthly incarnations.[24] The first manuscripts of these fables were ornamented with symbolical pictures that were regarded as parts of the text itself and so were handed down practically unaltered. Later, in the printed volumes that circulated all over Europe, other designs were substituted that were quite in keeping with the illustrations of the emblem books. Another such collection

[23] Sambucus, *Emblemata.* Antwerp, 1564; and G. Faerno, *Fabulae Centum.* Romae, 1563. I have used the London edition of 1672. The emblems cited are found in G. Whitney's *Choice of Emblemes.* London, 1586, pp. 27, 245, 251.

[24] *The Earliest English Version of the Fables of Bidpai.* J. Jacobs, ed. London, n. d., pp. ix, xi, xiii, xxiii.

of animal stories, Horapollo's *Hieroglyphica,* descended from Oriental sources. Its purpose was to explain the symbols found on Egyptian monuments. The author, for example, shows how the phoenix represents the soul in its temporary life on earth; a man returning after long absence to his friends; and the immortality of the soul. The book was compiled by Horapollo in the fifth century, was translated into Greek by an unknown follower, named Philip, and finally in the sixteenth century was rendered into Latin. This Latin version was first printed in Venice in 1505 and passed through twenty editions in hardly more than a century.[25] From it later compilers like Alciati took their stories of the hunted beaver; the stork's feeding her young; the cock, the lion, and the church; and the bees' seeking their hive. The legend of the phoenix, also, was frequently used by emblem writers, for example by Camerarius, and nothing held a more important place than that in the *Hieroglyphica.*[26]

These collections of animal stories furnished the material for the bestiaries that were widely popular through the middle ages. But the most direct source for those books was a treatise called the *Physiologus,* compiled by a Greek from Oriental sources in the second century after Christ. The author is unknown; the original text has disappeared; but the book became the common property of medieval writers.

The elephant, according to the *Physiologus,* is accustomed to lean against a tree when it wishes to sleep. Hunters, knowing this habit, cut part way through the tree. The trunk then gives way, when the animal's weight comes against it, and the victim falls to the ground. There it lies helpless, since, being jointless, it cannot rise, until the captors bind it fast.[27] The bestiaries also tell us that mariners have often mistaken a whale for an island and have tried to cast anchor and land.

[25] H. Green, *Shakespeare and the Emblem Writers,* pp. 22-24. *The Hieroglyphics of Horapollo.* A. T. Cory, ed. London, 1840, pp. 54-56.

[26] *Symbolorum et Emblematum Centuriae Tres.* Book 3, emblem 100.

[27] *Old English Miscellany.* R. Morris, ed. London, 1872.

A boy familiar with the adventures of Sinbad the Sailor will doubtless recognize the story at once. But, although it originated in the East, it reappeared time and time again in books of travel, and finally found its place in *Paradise Lost*. These stories were frequently used by the emblem writers, for they were of interest to readers and could be effectively illustrated. That was especially true after the alleged facts from natural history ceased to be mystical and became merely ethical. The manuscripts of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were fully illustrated, and many of those early illustrations were copied by the engravers of the emblem books.

One of the first emblem books of this type was the *Physiologist*, composed, it is generally thought, by Epiphanius, a bishop of Constantia, Cyprus, in the fourth century, and published at Rome in 1587 and at Antwerp in 1588.[28] Like the *Physiologus* it draws its moral lessons from qualities attributed to animals. For example, to enforce the precept, "Honor thy father and thy mother," a stork is represented in the picture and described in the text carrying food to a helpless bird. The same method was employed in the *Dyalogus Creaturarum Moralizatus*, a collection of fables of which an English version appeared in 1520 under the title, *The Dialogue of Creatures Moralysed*.[29] From this sort of book came ultimately such emblem books as Camerarius' *Symbolorum et Emblematum Centuriae Tres*. It is divided into three parts, treating of herbs and plants, animals, and birds and insects. The homilies that precede each emblem in this interesting volume plainly show the relationship between it and the bestiaries. Some of its illustrations simply reproduce the pictures found in the old manuscripts of the *Dyalogus*.

Still another work encouraged sixteenth-century moralists to call on engravers for help in teaching their lessons. Even in the days before printed books were known, the central facts

[28] *Shakespeare and the Emblem Writers*, pp. 28-29.

[29] Photolithographic facsimile edition, Stockholm, 1883, of a Danish manuscript. An early copy is in the New York Public Library.

in sacred history were taught by the designers of the popular *Biblia Pauperum* and the *Speculum Salvationis*. Each page in these illustrated manuscripts displayed a group of pictures, closely related by the teachings of the church. The central picture, for example, on one page represents Christ bearing the Cross. On either hand, stand the two incidents in Old Testament history that prefigure that story—Isaac bearing the wood for the sacrifice and the woman whom Elijah found gathering sticks for the fire. Lastly, four small cuts, arranged circlewise about the central picture, represent the prophetic passages that bear on the story of the Crucifixion. On the same page, also, are printed the verses from the Bible that explain the pictures. In other manuscripts, Christ's descent into hell is depicted with its Old Testament types—Samson's struggle with the lion and David's victory over Goliath. In another manuscript of the *Speculum Salvationis,* two pictures are placed together, one representing the last supper and the other the Children of Israel gathering manna in the wilderness.[30] These illustrated Bibles antedated the invention of printing; but during the sixteenth century many, especially in Germany, were sent to the press.

Naturally, they afforded many suggestions for emblems based on sacred story. Of these books John David's *Paradisus Sponsi et Sponsae,* published in Antwerp in 1607, most nearly resembles its predecessors. In it each scene from the New Testament is surrounded with pictures of the typological stories from the Old Testament. On these plates the chief details are marked by letters, by which the reader is directed to the proper parts, correspondingly marked, of the long prose expositions that expound each emblem. For example, about a central picture of the cross on one plate are grouped the seven sayings of Christ, while below the cross, on either hand, are the harp player of the thirty-third Psalm and the seven candlesticks of Exodus twenty-five. This is precisely the method of the *Biblia Pauperum.*

[30] É. Mâle, *L'Art Religieux du XIII^e Siècle.* Paris, 1902, pp. 207-209; A. N. Didron, *Christian Iconography.* London, 1886, 2, pp. 196-201, 211.

From all such sources the early emblematists drew precedent for their employment of picture and exposition in the teaching of moral truth. They found material with which to work in Biblical story, in fables, and in history or legend. Piecemeal, in fragments of this kind, such as the *Adagia* of Erasmus and the *Varia Historia* of Aelian, the modern world learned much of ancient history, science, and the affairs of the world. Much this same classification of material commonly found in the emblem books was adopted by Geoffrey Whitney, one of the first in England to compile such a volume. In his preface he explained that "Emblemes for the most parte, maie be reduced into these three kindes, which is Historicall, Naturall, & Morall. Historicall, as representing the actes of some noble persons, being matter of history. Naturall, as in expressing the natures of creatures, for example, the love of the yonge Storkes, to the oulde, or of suche like. Morall, pertaining to virtue and instruction of life, which is the chiefe of the three."[31] Assuredly, the material at the command of the emblematist was almost unlimited. Before the death of Shakespeare over two hundred authors had compiled works of this sort, and over seven hundred volumes had appeared. Yet there was much repetition and borrowing from volume to volume. To study comparatively the various editions of one popular author, like Alciati, would be a heavy burden; to read and compare all would be impossible.

Fortunately, then, for the modern reader, Geoffrey Whitney published in 1586 his compilation, *A Choice of Emblemes*. The volume offers, presumably, what the author and his contemporaries considered the most representative and approved emblems. Two hundred forty-eight devices were so selected. Of them only twenty-three were Whitney's own; the rest come from varied sources—86 from Alciati, 32 from Paradin, 48 from Sambucus, 20 from Hadrian Junius, 16 from Gabriel Faerno, and 23 others from ideas common in all such books.[32]

[31] *Choice of Emblemes*. Preface. London, 1586. Facsimile edition, London, 1866.

[32] H. Green, *Choice of Emblemes*, pp. 243-252.

Whitney, of course, often amplified his borrowings or gave to them a somewhat new application; but many poems remained simply translations or adaptations. His pictures, too, were old. The book was printed in Antwerp at the Plantin Press, where many fine volumes of the same kind had been issued, and where old plates were easily available. In all respects, therefore, Whitney's work is a comprehensive anthology.

Better than in other books, whose scope was more restricted, the modern reader can sense in *A Choice of Emblemes* the varied appeal that such literature would have for readers of the sixteenth century. Men well versed in history and literature and those who knew nothing would be equally drawn, though for different reasons, to the historical pieces. Under a picture of a warrior falling on his sword, one poem begins:

> When Brutus knewe, Augustus parte preuail'de,
> And sawe his frendes, lie bleedinge on the grounde,
> Suche deadlie griefe, his noble harte assail'de,
> That with his sworde, hee did him selfe confounde.

Another lesson is drawn from the legend of Circe:

> O stoppe your eares, and shutte your eies, of Circes cuppes beware.

In exactly the same fashion, statecraft could be taught as well as history. Accompanying the picture of an elephant leaning against a tree that has been partly cut through, a poem begins:

> No state so sure, no seate within this life
> But that maie fall, thoughe longe the same haue stoode.

Such worldly wisdom would be neither new nor uninteresting to courtiers who a few years before had witnessed the production of *Gorboduc*. So also those who had seen *Alexander and Campaspe* would find an appeal in the picture of Diogenes, seated in a huge barrel, while sceptered Alexander hurries to greet him. The moral, as often was the case, is trite enough:

What man is ritche? not he that doth abounde.
What man is pore? not hee that hath no store.
But he is ritche, that makes content his grounde,
And he is pore, that couettes more and more.

Whitney's uncultured readers would probably find other emblems more interesting than these. Some, for example, were based on fable, like the story of the grasshopper and the ant that served as an antidote against idleness. Equally popular in character is the couplet:

His seruantes God preserues, thoughe they in danger fall:
Euen as from vipers deadlie bite, he kept th' Appostle Paule.

Less moral in application, but just as interesting to a generation of Englishmen deeply concerned over continental politics, would be the picture of an old walled town against which the cannon of a besieging army are turned. Another design, showing the dyer at his vat, gave the reader some idea of industrial processes. *A Choice of Emblemes,* therefore, was a book for all classes of people. A wide-awake child could learn a good deal from its pages, and for mature readers it was history, literature, and sermon combined.

One of the most interesting of Whitney's original compositions was dedicated to Sir Francis Drake, who had but recently performed his great exploit in the Golden Hind. The picture shows a little vessel riding under full sail on top of a small globe. From the ship's stern a cable runs about the globe and up to the heavens, where it is held by the guiding hand of God. The poet, after reciting Drake's glorious deeds, and comparing him with Jason, ends with the appeal:

And you, that liue at home, and can not brooke the flood,
Geue praise to them, that passe the waues, to doe their countrie good.

Then in another poem Whitney remembers his old school at Audlem and exhorts the boys to "watche, write, and reade, and

spende no idle hower." And again, on the burning of Nampt-wiche in Cheshire and its rebuilding, he expressed the hope:

> Euen so (I hope) this Wiche, that nowe appeares,
> A Phoenix age shall laste, and knowe no losse.[33]

Whitney's *Choice of Emblemes* represents adequately, at least up to the time of its publication, the general scope and character of these literary emblem books. The compiler's purpose was moral or ethical and not exclusively Christian. His sources, therefore, were from fable, history, legend, and literature. Other early emblematists followed the same comprehensive plan. In the *Emblemata* of Sambucus, for example, one may find stories of the gallant ship and the sun, Actaeon seized by the hounds, Pliny overcurious, the thief strangled by his own cord, the elephant trapped, and the climbing ivy. Many compilers, however, instead of availing themselves of this diversified material, chose to restrict themselves to one field. Side by side, therefore, with these varied books stand others that expound one subject only or draw material from a single source. As a rule, they are less interesting to readers to-day than is a book like Whitney's; but each would appeal strongly to a certain sort of readers and offer something new to a public already familiar with the emblems of general human interest.

One special class of book recognized by Menestrier and other writers on the art, was the heroical emblem that celebrated great families or noble deeds. It was distinguished from other emblems by its application to particular persons. So Gabriel Symeon arranged his *Emblemes Heroiques et Morales* in these two classes, in the first of which are poems dedicated to Augustus, Titus, and other historical personages. Another similar volume was translated into English as *The Heroicall Devises of M. Claudius Paradin*. One might mention, also, a book by Fabricius, *Delle Allusioni, Imprese, et Emblemi . . . sopra la Vita, Opere, et Attioni di Gregorio XIII* and Silvester

[33] H. Green, *Choice of Emblemes*, pp. 70, 82, 150, 198, 175, 166, 189, 198, 203, 172, 177.

of Petrasancta's *Symbola Heroica*. Such emblems, of course, are closely related to the books on heraldry already discussed, like Camilli's *Imprese Illustri* and De Boot's *Symbola Varia*.[34]

As the nobility would be most pleased by these heroical emblems, the attention of the common man would be caught by the books that dealt exclusively with popular fables. Camerarius must have appealed largely to such readers with his *Symbolorum et Emblematum Centuriae Tres*. Equally interesting is the *Mythologia Ethica* of Freytag, published by the Plantin Press in 1579. One might easily guess the nature of its contents from the pictures of the stork, the ape, the deer, the elephant, and other birds and animals that block in the long title. A person interested in fables might then leaf through the beautifully printed volume, until his attention was drawn by the motto, "Stulta certi pro incerto commutatio." Beneath it is printed the picture of a dog crossing a bridge with a bit of meat in his mouth, while in the stream below his shadow is reflected. The lesson is plain from the inscription—"Auarus non implebitur pecunia: & qui amat diuitias, fructum non capiet ex eis"; yet it might be reinforced by the simple fable on the opposite page, "Canis ab umbra decepti."

In exactly the same manner Freytag presents other homilies on conduct, using fables that have been common property since the time of the medieval bestiaries. The old familiar contest between the hare and the tortoise is there. Freytag's stories are neatly told, and the drawings are invariably interesting. There are pictures of walled towns with church spires rising above the masonry; landscapes of meadow land, where cows are grazing by the brooks, and of wooded hills; and little sketches from real life of the smith at his forge, an old-fashioned cart rumbling along a mountain pass, some fishermen drawing their nets, two fagot bearers on a roughly cobbled village street, and, finally, an old carter beating his horses vigorously as they ford a

[34] Symeon's work was published in 1557 and translated into English in 1591. I have used the Lyons edition of 1561. Picinello defines the heroical emblem in *Mundus Symbolicus*. Preface.

stream. In fact, the *Mythologia Ethica* is full of interest for those who care at all for either the landscapes or the genre painting of Holland.[35]

There were emblems of another sort, also, that sought to illumine and enforce, for the sake of more scholarly readers, the poetry and philosophy of ancient times. The works of Ovid, Homer, and Horace were utilized by the poet and engraver in this way. Van Veen's edition of Horace, *Q. Horati Flacci Emblemata,* printed at Antwerp in 1607, will suffice for illustration. The poet himself, it is said in the preface, had used the expression, "ut pictura poesis erit," and Simonides, according to Plutarch, had called a picture a silent poem and poetry a speaking picture. By resort to both, therefore, the editor hoped to convey the truths of Horace with double force. For subjects like "Virtus Inconcussa" and "Agriculturae Beatitudo," he gathered a number of apt quotations from Horace and other classical writers, which were then illustrated by large copperplate engravings. Aesop's *Fables* were often treated in the same way. Other books presented lessons from ancient philosophy. Such, for example, was the *Doctrine of Morality; or, A View of Human Life,* which, first written in the seventeenth century, was translated from the French of De Gomberville in 1721. Van Veen's *Theatro Moral,* printed in 1672, was based on the teachings of Epictetus. The editor of the former expressed the rationalistic view of his age when he wrote, "a good Moralist oft makes a good Christian." But long before that date, North had translated the *Fables of Bidpai* under the title, *The Morall Philosophy of Doni.*

Other emblem books satisfied the desire for encyclopedic information. In the second volume of Ferro's *Teatro d' Imprese,* after the long, critical exposition of the first, a great many *imprese* are collected. The arrangement is alphabetical. For the word, Anchora, with its motto, "Et iacta salutem," a ship is represented at anchor. Then other instances of the symbolical

[35] German emblem books, like Cramer's *Emblemata Moralia Nova,* 1630, and Bornitius' *Symbola et Emblemata,* 1678, are usually rich in local color.

use of the anchor in *imprese* are cited, so that an artist or emblematist could readily see how the device had been used before. In the same fashion, for the motto, "Minimo detineor," an emblematical treatment is suggested for the remora, that little fish that was said to deter the progress of a ship by fixing itself to the stern. In its completeness and its methodical arrangement, Ferro's compilation is strikingly different from many little emblem books that preceded it.

But a still more comprehensive and methodical work, the *Mundus Symbolicus,* was issued by Picinello in 1680. In the first section of this huge folio the natural bodies, as they are called, are grouped alphabetically—the heavens, the four elements, gods and men, animals, trees, metals, and the like. Artificial bodies are gathered in the second part. But the book has comparatively few pictures. Before the section, "Instrumenta Domestica," a shield is printed, bearing the motto, "Omnibus Omnia." Another picture of an angler on a river bank landing a fish illustrates the motto, "Tenet atque Tenetur." Or again, in the biographical section of the work, the story of St. Stephen is narrated with a picture of his martyrdom affixed. In the text, the compiler gathers such mottoes as "nunquam non pervia justo" and "Gaudet patientia duris," which seem suitable for use in connection with the martyr and which are illustrated by excerpts from the Fathers. To the enormous labor involved in this encyclopedic compilation from the volumes of Van Veen, Ferro, and Ripa, Picinello was impelled by the hope of furnishing suggestive ideas to orators, preachers, scholars, and poets.

But no one of these special types of book possesses the variety and the general interest of the moral emblems. Menestrier, in classifying the different sorts of emblems, gave precedence to them, and another early critic, Picinello, called attention to the almost unlimited material from which both their designers and poets could draw, and to the wide appeal of their contents. Their pictures expressed character or action or both, and their poems possessed often real literary value.

Of all this richness of content, Whitney's selection offers ample proof.

In this respect Whitney's *Choice of Emblemes* little resembles its more celebrated English rival, the *Emblemes* of Francis Quarles, published in 1635. Quarles was described by his widow as "a Gentleman both by birth and desart, descended of an ancient Family, and yet (which is rare in these last and worst times) . . . an ornament to his Ancestors."[36] His father was a gentleman, and the poet's early surroundings were conducive to refinement and high ideals. Twenty years before Milton's time, he was enrolled in Christ's College, Cambridge, and later in Lincoln's Inn. But his inclinations were less for law than for study and reflection. At one time he served as cup bearer to Princess Elizabeth; later, he was employed as secretary to Archbishop Usher and as Chronologer of the city of London. He remained a staunch loyalist during the Puritan wars. Yet the preponderance of religious interests in his verse, and the fact, too, that Anthony à Wood called him the "darling of our plebeian judgments," might cause one offhand to place him, in spite of his bitter animosity against rebels and nonconformists, with the Puritans.

"An Embleme is but a silent Parable," Quarles explained in his "Epistle to the Reader." As such, its concrete, corporeal handling of divine matters, that might else be objectionable, is free from censure; since Christ spoke of himself often as a sower, fisher, reaper, or physician, no one should scruple "to see the allusion to our blessed Savior figured in these types." Indeed, "what are the Heavens, the Earth, nay every creature," he inquired, "but Hieroglyphicks and Emblemes of his Glory."

What drew from Quarles this defence of emblem writing we cannot know. Assuredly, there was nothing strange or new in his book. It is divided into five sections. Of them, the last three were taken directly, with only a slight alteration of two poems, from Hermann Hugo's *Pia Desideria,* which first appeared in

[36] *Poems.* A. B. Grosart, ed., 1, p. xii.

1624 with woodcuts and in 1628 with copperplate engravings. Only the poems of the first two parts were original with Quarles, and they are in perfect harmony with the rest of the volume. Quarles based his moral lessons on Biblical verses chosen by Hugo; he used the plates of the *Pia Desideria* reversed; and, although his poems are often quite different from Hugo's, they still show dependence. Furthermore, in the citations from the writings of early churchmen that enforce the moral of each emblem, Quarles followed Hugo closely. As a rule, the English book took only one or two of the briefer excerpts; but Quarles added nothing of his own choosing. In the fifth book, where the extracts are taken not simply from the works of Gregory, Augustine, Hugo of St. Victor, but from less familiar mystical treatises like the *Scala Paradisi,* Quarles' dependence on Hugo is very noticeable. There was nothing, therefore, in his emblems to necessitate an apology.

In the *Pia Desideria,* to enforce the verse, "Dolores inferni circumdederunt me," Death is represented drawing two low nets about a youth stretched prone on the ground. Within the inclosure, circled by the flames of hell, devils hunt their prey. The engraving is explained by Hugo's poem, which Quarles copied, and by the patristic comments. The hunters are devils, their hounds are temptations, and the net represents the lures and deceits that ensnare mankind. Most unpoetically, then, Quarles lists twenty-two sorts of temptations before he brings his homily to a close. Several quotations from St. Ambrose and other early churchmen and a four-line epigram conclude the piece.

This in general was the method of the English emblematist. Another poem is based on the text in *Ecclesiastes,* "There is no end of all his labor, neither is his eye satisfied with riches." The moral is plain: that man is ever striving for earthly wealth, his desires growing each day like the crescent moon. The artist shows us a youth grasping tightly in outstretched arms a huge globe, while an angel looks on in amazement, possibly at the

heavenly rays that fall so unerringly on the materialist's head. Although the moral should be obvious,

> Let not thy nobler thoughts be alwayes raking
> The world's base dunghill,

it is clinched by a quotation from Hugo's *De Anima* and by the poet's own epigram. This is the only piece in the second book that Quarles did not take from the *Pia Desideria*.

Quarles, on the whole, offers monotonous reading. He harps incessantly on the sordidness of life. The earth is called a floor, a disease, a sea, an ocean, a cask—anything, almost, that will give ground for the accusation,

> She's empty, hark she sounds,

and,

> False world, thou ly'st: Thou canst not lend
> The least delight.

So, in this unfeeling way, Quarles berates poor Mother Earth through many emblems. Nevertheless, in others he swings far to the other extreme as he reproduces the sensuous imagery, if not actually the feeling of the *Canticles*.

In general, Quarles' poems are more independent of the pictures than most poems of the kind were. Hampered by his engraving, he could stoop even to this:

> What, never fill'd? Be thy lips skrew'd so fast
> To th' earth's full breast?

His more independent pieces, however, resemble other sacred poems in form. Although Quarles may start, as he does in the above poem, with a reference to the crude engraving, he seldom holds to it to the end. He was therefore the most uneven of poets. He could sink unconsciously from good verse to actual bathos. But his really musical lyric with its varying refrain, "Sweet Phospher, bring the day," and his powerful indictment,

"False world, thou ly'st," are exceptionally good. Usually, however, even his best poems are marred by grave lapses in taste, and few hold their lyric power to the end.

Shortly after the publication of Quarles' adaptation of Hugo's emblems, a more direct translation was issued by Edmund Arwaker. Early in life he had felt the need of a faithful English rendering, since Quarles had "only borrow'd his Emblems to prefix them to much inferiour Sense." Nevertheless, despite these pretentions, Arwaker omitted in translating certain fabulous stories that seemed to him ill suited to devotion, and inserted in their place Biblical stories. He was also strong enough in his Protestantism to reject Hugo's excerpts from saints' legends and martyrologies, and firm enough in his loyalty not to forget the late King, "our fam'd Martyr."

If Edmund Arwaker in this way sought to rectify the work of Quarles, Christopher Harvey was content to follow as a respectful imitator. His *Schola Cordis,* which appeared in 1647, was based on a volume of the same title that had appeared at Antwerp in 1629. Of each picture the human heart is the focal detail.[37] The engraver shows, for example, the heart lying on one side of a balance, while the two tables of stone weigh down the other. Again, a little angel drives a spike into the heart with a sledge hammer. Next, the heavenly messenger appears with birchen rods to flog the unfortunate, that has been tied to a whipping post. In another plate, called "The New Wine of the Heart," something quite like a hot-water bottle is being filled at a wine-press. Cuts and poems alike are distressingly crude compared with earlier engravings that depict real life and people. The best that can be said is that usually an angel is responsible for what most offends modern taste.

Although the emblem never flourished in England as it did on the Continent, many other volumes than those mentioned were published there. Thomas Combe's *Theatre of Fine Devices,* published in 1592 as a translation from the French, is

[37] In Christian Hohburg's *Lebendige Hertzens Theologie,* each picture is set, or framed, in a representation of the human heart.

now known only by title.[38] Six years later Thomas Willet followed with his *Sacrorum Emblematum Centuria Una.* Some of the theoretical treatises in English have already been mentioned. But they, as indeed many of the emblem books as well, were derived from French and Italian sources.

Compilers then began to build their emblems about one certain idea. Harvey used the heart as his fixed point. Another example of such specialization is found in the *Emblemata Sacra de Fide, Spe, Charitate* of Hesius.[39] In the introductory engraving a little Cupid leaning on an anchor as a symbol of faith, holds out a scroll, on which the title is engraved. The book contains in all forty-one emblems on faith, in which the poet plays a good deal on the double meaning of *fides* (faith and lute-string); thirty on hope; and forty on charity. The plan of the book closely resembles that of Corrozet's; each piece embraces a Biblical verse, a picture, a motto and short poem, and, lastly, a longer explanatory poem in elegiac verse. The pictures are largely symbolical, illustrative of the three cardinal virtues.

Other similar volumes impose the restriction not on the subject but on the design; in them the artist and not the poet proved the specialist. In George Stengel's *Ova Paschalia,* published in 1635, each main picture is set in the outline of an egg, not more than two inches in size. But around this oval picture, to fill in the corners of the square plate, four little pictures are inserted, which blend most artistically, in subject and design, with the main picture. Although there are only one hundred emblems in all, the homilies attached to them are sufficiently long to fill out the volume to over six hundred pages. In one picture three men are seated on a grassy hillock, with their horses resting beside them. All are cracking the shells of eggs, preparatory to making their noonday meal. The author explains that seven blunders in etiquette can be committed in the breaking and eating of eggs. They may be broken, he says on the

[38] W. C. Hazlitt, *Handbook.* London, 1867, p. 116.
[39] Published at Antwerp, 1636.

authority of an ornithologist, in three ways: the Jews break them on the small end and refrain from eating if any drop of blood is disclosed; the Italians break them on the large end; and the Germans open them on the side. Then follows a long homily on the rearing of children, dull enough to eradicate the pleasant impression left by the quaint design. For one who is satisfied to leaf through the volume, scrutinizing the details of the little pictures and foregoing the pleasure of the reading, the *Ova Paschalia* is one of the most attractive of the emblem books.

England can boast of one such quaint book. In Robert Farlie's *Lychnocausia, sive Moralia Facum Emblemata,* each one of the fifty-odd engravings shows a candle, lanthorn, beacon, or some other light-bearing instrument.[40] Hence the little book was given its strange-sounding Greek title, which means "the lighting of lamps," with a Latin sub-title for the aid of less cultured readers, and with a still further sub-title, *Lights Morall Emblems,* in English for the benefit of those who have no culture at all. One of the emblems tells how the Greeks on their way home from Troy were misled by signal lights placed over dangerous reefs and suffered shipwreck. Thus within the limits of his narrow field, Farlie really succeeded in introducing an interesting variety of subjects.

Another such specialized emblem book was the *Emblemes of Love in Four Languages,* published in 1683 by Philip Ayres. It contains forty-five plates, accompanied by short poems, not exactly identical, in Latin, English, French, and Italian. It was based on Van Veen's *Amorum Emblemata,* published in Antwerp in various editions in the early years of the century. The copy of Ayres' book that I own reproduces the plates of Van Veen reversed and copies his Latin and Italian poems exactly,

[40] London, 1638. Some of its emblems are poorly reproduced in *Moral Emblems . . . from Jacob Cats and Robert Farlie.* London, 1860. Cats' emblems were reproduced in Heywood's *Pleasant Dialogues.* London, 1637. In 1638 Farlie published another illustrated book, the *Kalendarium Humanae Vitae,* which contains poems on the twelve months grouped in seasons. I have described both books in greater detail in the *Philological Quarterly,* 1, pp. 23-30.

but does not follow the French version at all. Comparison with another edition of these emblems might disclose a new relationship. But quite apart from these bibliographical problems, the book has an interest of its own. Each cut represents the little god, Cupid, in a new situation. In one emblem he is seen in a barnyard, and in another he is placing a lighted candle under a bushel. Again, he is in a little fishing boat helping to draw the net, or whimpering in the arms of Venus after the misadventure at the bee-hive. In such fashion, the English emblematists sought to add a certain novelty to the familiar literary form.

Another Englishman, Henry Peacham, brought the emblem book back to its heroical subject matter in 1612. His *Minerva Britanna, or a Garden of Heroical Deuises,* in addition to emblems of the common variety, offered a number of complimentary poems to Sir Henry Wotton, Lord Bacon, and other gentlemen. The pictures are in the nature of devices, and the accompanying verses simply explain their meaning and handily turn some compliment to the nobleman honored. Such use of the emblem was not altogether new; for poems had often been dedicated to noted men, and one type of emblem had been devoted exclusively to heraldic devices. But the *Mirrour of Maiestie* contains nothing but this form of emblem.[41] From the mirror thirty-three faces are reflected—the King and Queen, the Prince of Wales, Archbishop Abbot, Lord Bacon, the Earl of Southampton, and others. On the page to the left, the nobleman's coat of arms is printed and briefly described in verse; on the right appears an emblem of the common type. Sir Henry Wotton's coat of arms, for example, was no more than a simple cross. This is briefly explained, and then on the opposite page, underneath an engraving, stands the poem, possibly suggested by Cebes:

[41] Part of *Minerva Britanna* is reproduced in the Holbein Society's reprint of *The Mirrour of Maiestie.* Manchester, 1870. To the mock commendatory poem by Peacham printed in Coryate's *Crudities,* a pair of boots, placed toes together, was added as a sort of emblem.

> Th' ascending Path that up to wisedome leades
> Is rough, uneuen, steepe: and he that treades
> Therein, must many a tedious Danger meet,
> . . . till he come at last
> Vp to Her gate, where Learning keepes the key,
> And lets him in, Her best Things to survay.

In the volume there are thirty-two such combinations of mottoes, devices, and emblems; and the book in general marks a departure from the usual English emblem book. Yet the author signs himself only "H. G.," leaving the reader to speculate whether he may not have been Henry Goodyer, the friend and correspondent of John Donne.

Another modification of the standard emblem book was made in 1635 by the versatile poet, George Wither. In his *Collection of Emblemes, Ancient and Moderne* nothing startlingly new is at first noticeable. The plates had been used before, and many ideas were borrowed from Alciati and other early compilers. But one phrase in the long title, "disposed into Lotteries, that instruction and good counsell may be furthered by an honest and pleasant re-creation," leads one to look further. On the last page two plats or diagrams are fixed. On one, an arrow in the centre of a circle can be turned to any of the numbers printed in the circumference; on the other, the arrow will point to one of the four corners of a square. The reader who is disposed to play Wither's harmless game, is thus referred to a particular poem in one of the four books, and finds there, possibly, something to his benefit. As in any other lottery, a blank may be drawn, for the numbers on the plat exceed the number of poems in any book. Yet Wither argued that the game would be a diversion for children and possibly a profit to their elders, quite free from the evils of dice and other games of chance.

The history of the emblem in the United States offers nothing new or interesting. The famous New England Primer was an emblem book designed as a first reader for children. Another collection, published in Philadelphia in 1790, was called *Choice Emblems, Natural, Historical, Fabulous, Moral, and Divine.*

The emblem, it seems, endured longest in New Haven. In 1810 a little volume called *Emblems of Mortality* appeared there. It was taken from a recent London reprint of an old edition of the Dance of Death, which represents the summons as it is delivered to fifty different classes of people. Apparently, the emblem had gone full circle and stood again at one of its points of origin. Another volume, called *Religious Emblems,* appeared in 1846. One would judge that the publisher, Barber, knew no more of his subject than that "works of a somewhat similar kind have occasionally appeared," and he was either vain or ignorant enough to promise better and more helpful lessons than the old. The "first western edition" of this volume appeared in 1851, and five years later Barber, in presenting another edition to the Yale Library, noted on the flyleaf that the book had been reissued in Boston, Cincinnati, and London. He must have found, then, a wide public for his work; but unquestionably it was an uncultured public that derived satisfaction from his crude pictures and still cruder poems. The emblem had passed out of general favor, and the editor dared speak disparagingly of its remarkable career.

A single contrast will show plainly the waning popularity of the emblem. In Gabriel Harvey's day at Cambridge, students were neglecting Aristotle and the schoolmen for Castiglione, Jovius, and Paradin.[42] The vogue was then at its height. But in 1686 John Bunyan published *A Book for Boys and Girls; or, Country Rhymes for Children in Verse on Seventy-four Things.* This book was long regarded as lost, since no bibliographer connected it with the *Divine Emblems* of Offor's edition, which contains less than seventy-four pieces. Recently, however, the first edition of *Country Rhymes* has been discovered and it is seen to be the original of the *Divine Emblems.*[43] But more interesting than this bibliographer's problem is the significance of the title. Emblem books, which had once been the delight of all, cultured and uncultured, are here supposedly of use only

[42] *Letter-Book.* E. J. L. Scott, ed. Camden Society. London, 1884.
[43] Reprinted by J. Brown, London, 1890.

for boys and girls, and the contents are offered as country rhymes. After an address to the reader, the book offers a page of specimen alphabets as "an help to Children to learn to read English"; then two lists of given names for boys and girls and of Roman and Arabic numerals; then, finally, the emblems. As poems they are bad enough. But on subjects like the beggar and the whipping top, Bunyan shows indebtedness to his predecessors. Historically, therefore, as well as bibliographically, the *Country Rhymes* is of interest. One may safely assert that Bunyan is the best known, if not the best, writer of emblems.

But of even greater interest is Edmund Spenser's relation to emblem literature. In his volume of *Complaints,* published in 1591, two groups of sonnets appeared, the *Visions* of Petrarch and Du Bellay. Each sonnet describes a scene of grandeur and the ruin that ensues. The pictures suggested by the author and the moral lessons drawn, conform to the customary methods of the emblematists, although the volume contained no engravings. But virtually these same sonnets, written in blank verse, had appeared in 1569 in *A Theatre of Voluptuous Worldlings,* which was a translation of an emblem book by John Van der Noodt that had appeared during the preceding year in Dutch and French. The *Theatre* contained twenty-one poems, of which six are translated from Petrarch, eleven are taken from Du Bellay, and only the last four strongly Protestant pieces are by Van der Noodt himself. The sonnets are illustrated by woodcuts, in most of which the scenes both in grandeur and ruin are represented, and the moral is enforced in a long prose commentary. This little volume is the first English emblem book. Moreover, it contains almost the earliest blank verse written in our language, and offers probably the first composition of the youthful Spenser. Some critics deny his authorship of the poems in their early form, on the ground that he never again used blank verse, and that the revised poems are less exact renderings of the original than the sonnets in the *Theatre.* Space does not allow an adequate discussion of this perplexing question. We believe, however, that had the printer of the

Complaints in 1591 taken as Spenser's two groups of sonnets not really his, he would have included the four sonnets of Van der Noodt as well. As it was, he reprinted the translations of Petrarch and Du Bellay, but omitted the four at the end of the volume. Most editors of Spenser are inclined to accept the genuineness of the poems. We must remember, therefore, that the first English emblem book contains some of our earliest blank verse and probably the first work, also, of the author of the *Faerie Queene*.[44]

Those who accept the Spenserian authorship of these poems may care to know that Spenser exhibited an interest in emblems in the slightly later series, unquestionably his, the *Visions of the Worlds Vanitie*. One of the pieces tells how the little remora can retard the course of a ship; another rehearses the old story of the eagle and the fly. The pictures that furnish foundation for both stories are to be found among Alciati's emblems, and the first is even more plainly printed in the volume of Camerarius. He also includes stories of the little bird cleaning the teeth of the grateful crocodile, and of the whale vomiting fishes. These, too, are in the *Visions,* and one may assume that all the poems are based on emblems that had interested the poet.[45] Moreover, the pictures in the *Theatre* are peculiar in that each represents its scene both before and after the ruin described in the poems. The visions in the *Ruines of Time* are of this same duplex kind—another fact that may indicate Spenser's authorship of the *Theatre*. Furthermore, even the *Shepheards Calender* closely approximates the emblem book; for it was published with woodcuts illustrating the different months, and after each poem the emblem, or, more strictly, the *mot,* of the characters is given. The stories of the

[44] T. de Vries, *Holland's Influence on English Language and Literature*. Chicago, 1916. The pictures in the *Theatre* have been reproduced by E. de Selincourt, *Spenser's Minor Poems*. Oxford, 1910. See an article by E. Koeppel, *Englische Studien,* 15, pp. 53-81. 1891.

[45] Alciati, nos. 82, 168; Camerarius, book 2, no. 98, book 4, nos. 3, 27. James Howell began one of his letters: "The Court of Spain affords now little news; for there is a Remora sticks to the business of the Match." 1, 3, no. 22.

oak and the briar and of the fox and the kid are just such fables as the emblematists were fond of. Clearly, Spenser had come under the influence of the genre.

Many other poems of the seventeenth century, like these by Spenser, were based on well-known emblems, although they were printed without pictures. In 1600 Francis Thynne dedicated to Sir Thomas Egerton a collection of "naked emblems," as he called them, "because they are not clothed with engraven pictures."[46] Thynne's poems deal with stories of the remora and of Aeneas, the example of filial piety, in a manner exactly like that of the emblematists. Indeed, the author in his dedication waived all discussion of the type, since he offered nothing unusual and since Egerton knew as well as anyone the generally accepted treatises of Jovius, Mignault, and Contile.

Other such "naked emblems" can be found in the literature of the time. William Drummond's poem, "This world a hunting is," which Professor Kastner attributes to Valerio Belli, had long been familiar to readers of Quarles and Hugo. The frontispiece in the first edition of Henry Vaughan's *Silex Scintillans* represented a stony heart smitten by a thunder bolt. Crashaw's poems, too, appeared with some illustrations. Richard Brathwaite, likewise, was a reader of emblems, for he wrote: "Fishing may be called the Embleme of this world, where miserable man, like the deluded fish, is ever nibbling at the bait of vanitie."[47] And even in Swift one finds at least two reminders of the old emblems. To illustrate the motto,

> Vt te ipsum & navim serves, comitesq' pericli,
> In pontum cunctas abjice devitias,

Camerarius used a picture of sailors throwing boxes and barrels from a ship's deck into the sea. And in Stengel's *Ova Paschalia* three men are found breaking eggs, of whom two reappear, strangely metamorphosed, in *Gulliver's Travels*. Both poetry

[46] *Emblemes and Epigrams,* F. J. Furnivall, ed. E. E. T. S. London, 1876.

[47] *English Gentleman,* p. 93. The same idea is expressed in the dedicatory poem of the *Compleate Angler.*

and prose, apparently, were permeated with the spirit of the emblem books.[48]

The history of the emblem might be carried still further. Arwaker, Quarles, and others who have enjoyed real popularity during the seventeenth century, were reprinted in later centuries with new and modernized plates. Picture books of all kinds were used for didactic purposes, especially by Quakers and dissenters in general. Hogarth affixed to each plate of *Industry and Idleness* a statement of the lesson taught and a verse from Scripture. Nevertheless, the usefulness and attraction of the emblems were largely gone. History, literature, and science could be better taught through other media. The best writers and the best engravers no longer deigned to handle the emblem. Especially, the wits of Queen Anne's reign looked down on it as old-fashioned and bourgeois. And although the middle classes still found satisfaction in emblems that were altogether religious, their other charms being lost, even they could better rouse their sluggish consciences by other means. So Pope dared write in the *Dunciad:*

> Or where the pictures for the page atone
> And Quarles is saved by beauties not his own.

Once the old art of poetry and the new art of engraving had combined; history, literature, fable, science, and life were drawn on for material. Then the union was dissolved, and the emblems gradually disappeared from literature.

[48] *Centuriae Tres,* Book 4, no. 2. *Ova Paschalia,* no. 40. See above, p. 59.

WAR JOURNALISM OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY[1]

OF all the agencies involved in the great world war, the newspapers, at the outbreak of hostilities, were more ready than any other for the demands placed upon them. Regiments had to be raised, munitions and supplies had to be provided, and means of transportation, in the face of dangers never confronted before, had to be assured. But the special correspondents were at once ready to take their posts at the front, and the newspapers at home were equipped to put the news in the most graphic form before the reading public.

Conditions in England were far different when that country, almost three hundred years ago, saw the outbreak of a struggle as momentous in every way as this world war has been. Journalism was then in its infancy. The regular appearance of a newspaper under a fixed name was hardly known, and, until 1641, the few short-lived papers that appeared were restricted by the watchful activities of the licenser of the press to foreign news. The difficulty of getting news; the lack of postal facilities for circulating the papers; and the ever present menace of the licensing act—all checked the natural growth of journalism. But the great Civil War, which broke out in 1642, changed all this. Plenty of news at home was in the making; the public, bitterly partisan for one cause or the other, was eager to be informed; and the power of the licenser was shattered as the government lost control. So a new opportunity was opened up to the pamphleteers of London, and the Civil War may be regarded as the most potent force that ever operated on the development of journalism in England.

[1] Reprinted, with the kind permission of the editor, from the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, vol. 28, 1920.

It is interesting to turn from the metropolitan daily of to-day, with its columns of cable dispatches, its reports of special war correspondents, its maps and profusely illustrated weekly supplements, to the small, five- or six-inch news-books that served the needs of the seventeenth century. They were virtually books rather than papers or sheets, for they were cut and printed like the other pamphlets of the day. And how strange the titles now sound, devised, as they were, not simply for identification but for information as well. *A continuation of certain speciall and remarkable passages informed to both houses of Parliament and otherwise from divers parts of this kingdome; A perfect diurnall of the passages in Parliament more fully and exactly taken than by any other printed copies, as you will finde upon comparing; Oxford diurnall: communicating the intelligence, and affaires of the court, to the rest of the kingdome; The Kingdomes weekly intelligencer: sent abroad to prevent mis-information.* Surely, the men and women who cried such titles on the streets of London were strong of lung. Copies of these old papers are to be found still in some of the large libraries of this country, their pages yellowed with age and frayed by use. Under the title one looks in vain for the large type of our day; a single headline from one of the current dailies would have filled almost a whole issue of *Mercurius Britanicus*. One of the papers, *A Perfect Diurnall of the Passages in Parliament,* was adorned often with a cut, arranged about three sides of the title, representing a group of shovel-hatted Puritan statesmen seated at the council table. In other issues of this news-book the initial letter was printed in the middle of a little picture representing a vessel out at sea under full sail. But in the main the printer used, and quite arbitrarily, only two fonts of type, a small Roman and italics, though he was always free to drop from a large to a small type if he found himself pressed for space in the setting. Yet the little, six- or eight-page news-books must have seemed to the citizens of Milton's London the acme of perfection, and, supplemented

as they often were by the manuscript additions of the first purchaser, they really gave the news that the people craved.

One may take as a typical specimen of these papers *Many Remarkable Passages from both Houses of Parliament,* for May 19, 1642. The King, it is announced, has determined to remove the next term of Parliament from Westminster to York. Accordingly, "this House, taking the said matter into consideration, hath Voted: That the Kings removall of the Terme to Yorke, from Westminster, during sitting of this Parliament, is illegal." The Commons also voted "that whosoever hee were that should attach or imprison either the said Members, or any other of each House, imployed on their service, should be accounted as an enemy to the State and Commonwealth." Another item tells how "Mistresse Sanders, living at Ratcliffe, was examined by the House charged with aiding her brother Oneale to escape." All of these bits of news are briefly summarized on the title-page, where there is almost as much information given as on the six pages of the little news-book.

The student, therefore, familiar with the history of the time, will look in vain for the "featuring" of important news. The items are customarily introduced by the news-writer in such phrases as these: "a true relation," "a true and exact relation," "there came letters from Northampton on Monday last," "Wednesday a Hat-full of Letters being intercepted," "it is informed that Lord Gray," and "the last newes from the West is very variously reported." Occasionally, the index finger of a printed hand called attention to an item of importance. For example, in *A Perfect Diurnall of the Passages in Parliament* (No. 45, Apr. 10, 1643) such a device points toward the marginal comment: "Note, herein is a true relation of another great victory attained by Sir William Waller (not inferiour to any of the rest) against P. Maurice, & his taking Tewxbury and the Magazine there." But ordinarily even such vital news as the battle at Newbury was not especially stressed. *The Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* (No. 10) in March, 1643, announced in its ordinary style that "the sad newes came to

towne on Saturday last of the death of the Lord Brooke, who was shot dead with a Musket Bullet as hee was looking out of a window, after he had entred the Town of Lichfield by Assault, and offered quarter to the Earle of Chesterfield." Other papers gave a fuller account of the treacherous shooting; but this journal simply added as an editorial judgment: "no Englishman had more devoted himselfe and his fortunes as a sacrifice to the cause in hand, then his Lordship had done," and recorded that "the Common-Souldiers as soone as he was slaine, were so enraged, that they vowed to give no quarter to the Earle of Chesterfield, nor any of the Forces of the Colledge."

The common formulae for introducing the various items of each week's news are proof of the accidental means of obtaining it. Rumor and surmise were still the journalists' chief recourses. And there were times when even such news was wanting. The Puritan editor of *Speciall Passages and Certain Informations from severall Places, collected for the Use of all that desire to be truely informed,* was simply more frank than other writers when he admitted, "so little of action hath been this last weeke in the Armies, that much cannot be here expected." Naturally, then, the regularity of these weeklies was often interrupted. *A Continuation* begins in one issue (No. 52) with this explanation: "some occasions more then ordinary, hath caused an intermission of the Diurnall these two weekes past, for which I must Apologize my Excuse, and promise a more constant and elaborate continuation for the time comming." Such good intentions often came to nought; one paper, in fact, expired with its promise of greater regularity in the future.

The news-books appeared professedly once a week, at first on Mondays to catch the single mail sent each week from London to the country, and later on Thursdays or Fridays, when a second post-day was arranged for. The royalist journal at Oxford had the hardihood to come forth on Saturday evening; but Puritan scruples on the Sabbath discountenanced the act, and Tuesday remained the commonest day for the

dissemination of news. Consequently, from week to week, as news came slowly in, the rival weeklies had varying fortunes in getting possession first of important news. And repetition, of course, was common, since no one editor could afford to neglect a story just printed by a competitor. According to an item in the *Continuation* (No. 30), a trunk was "intercepted upon the Thames neare London, . . . wherein was found a Packett of letters comming from the Queene and some others in Holland, which for the present are not to be reviled, there was also a great Pye found in the Trunck, but it is thought there will be found to be but unsavory meat in it when it is cutt up." This same story, with its innuendo, was repeated a few days later in *A Perfect Diurnall.* Such repetition must be where there is no general distributing agency for news, and where papers do not appear each day.

Just as necessarily the various papers were full of contradictory reports, and charges were frequently made of falsification and misrepresentation. The *Continuation* in 1643 reported the defeat of a royalist force (No. 26): "It is certainly informed that the Glocestershire Forces fell upon Sir John Byron in his quarters at a town called Burford (which is adjoyning upon Glocestershire) on Newyeares Eve, and killed about seven of his men, wounded the said Sir John, hurt many of his souldiers, and tooke twenty horse in one stable, and had it not been so late at night, that it was so dark they could not pursue them, they had given him a very great overthrow, and taken a brave booty." A quite different account of the fray was published in the *Oxford Diurnall.* On the thirtieth of December, according to this royalist authority, Sir John was ordered to lead his detachment to Burford. There he was attacked by five hundred rebels, who had been stationed at Cirencester. Sir John drove the attacking party "to the farther end of the lane where the Inn standeth, into which they ran, and into which he entring pell mell with them, received a blow on the face with a Pole-axe, or halbard." The building by that time was crowded with rebel musketeers, and Sir John was on horseback unarmed.

Accordingly, he returned to the market cross, reformed his troopers, and, storming the inn, drove the rebels out by the back door. The victors pursued the fleeing Roundheads six miles, but "being the night was wondrous darke and the Moone not risen, few of them could be overtaken." Only one of Sir John's troopers was killed and four injured. After this fashion the news was selected or manipulated to suit the cause, and each party accused the other of deceit. "If they fight and are beaten," a royalist journal complained, "then either they deny it, and give thanks for a victory; or else confess some small losse, which God sent to them by his speciall Providence to draw the Cavaleirs into further destruction."[2] Another royalist paper, *Mercurius Aulicus,* asserted (No. 4): "it doth passe for currant in the streets of London . . . that the Kings forces have the worst in all their enterprises; . . . and to beguile the people with the greater artifice, prisoners are led in triumph through the City, as if they had beene taken in those severall actions. Were it not that they did apply such Cordials, to keepe up the dejected spirits of their broken party, the cause had long ago beene subject unto fainting fits." Since the old Stuart days party enmity has not greatly changed its character.

A still more interesting divergence in the reports of the press was brought about by the affairs at Gloucester in 1643. The raising of the siege was so essential to the Puritans' cause that one of their journals declared: "the brave exploits of Colonell Massy in defending of Gloucester against the great body of the Kings army at this time challengeth our chiefest thoughts." Already, the editor announced, the besiegers had made several assaults only to be repulsed with heavy losses. Another attack yielded momentary possession of the city's outer fortifications; but "the Governour so thundered with his great and smale shot about their Eares, that he soone beate them from all their advantages" and forced them to retreat with the loss of 1500 men. Thereupon the King's forces intrenched themselves about

[2] *The Round-heads Remembrancer,* May 16, 1643.

the city, and Colonel Massey reported to Parliament that he could not hold his position more than fourteen days.[3]

The subsequent incidents of the siege are more fully given in *Mercurius Britanicus*. Lord Essex was sent by Parliament to the relief of the city. "Besides his owne Army, there is gone to his assistance two Regiments of the Trained Bands of London, and three Regiments of Auxiliaries, each Regiment compleating one with another a thousand men; besides a Regiment of Horse from the City, and Recrutes from his broken Regiments." The editor ventured to prophesy: "If Glocester hold out till Friday next the businesse will be disputed, (as no doubt they will) for on Wednesday last they were in that condition in the Towne, that they sallied, fought bravely, and retreated with honour, and brought in many Prisoners."

Despite this success, a report came to London from Oxford that the garrison had surrendered, the messenger asserting that he had been "an eye-witnesse of the King's entring Gloucester on Tuesday last." The editor of *Mercurius Britanicus* (Nos. 1, 3, 6), however, on *a priori* grounds stoutly denied the truth of this report, and the next week had proof to give. For a boy from the city had made his way into the royalist camp, professing to have been kept a prisoner by the defenders. He had learned there all that he could of the besiegers' plans and then hurried on to London with the news. By that time the garrison had been apprised by signal fires of the approaching aid, and within a few days the enemy was forced to retire, though not until the city's magazines were reduced to two barrels of powder. Then the trained bands returned to London and "marched in Triumph into the City in companies so full, that it could hardly be discerned any were missing, every man having a green bough (as they had in the battle) in his hat, and generally declared a resolution, that when ever his Excellency . . . would command their service againe, they would readily advance."

[3] *A Continuation,* no. 52, August 25, 1643.

Feeling naturally ran high as the war went on, and there was a great deal of editorial recrimination between the papers on the opposed sides. The *Oxford Diurnall,* which was afterward called *Mercurius Aulicus,* in justification of its first appearance, had a word of this sort to say. "The world hath long enough been abused with falsehoods: And there's a weekly cheat put out to nourish the abuse amongst the people, and make them pay for their seducement. And that the world may see that the Court is neither so barren of intelligence, as it is conceived; nor the affaires thereof in so unprosperous a condition, as these Pamphlets make them, it is thought fit to let them truly understand the state of things that so they may no longer pretend ignorance, or bee deceived with untruths." In this more refined and literary style the *Oxford Diurnall* made its first appeal; but it was soon forced, by the ribald wit of *Mercurius Britanicus,* to stoop to the level of the partizan press. The Puritan contemporary professed to be informed that a Bishop, a cavalier, and a courtier always collaborated with *Aulicus,* and that they would never suffer him to tell anything truthfully, assuring him "it was no matter what lies they writ, for some people would take them all for truth." In this fashion the bickering between the rivals went on. *Britanicus* announced in one issue that *Aulicus* had been surprised and "no fewer than five hundred lies were taken prisoners," and that the press at Oxford was again busy "recruting him fast." So the editor "passed by Master Aulicus" each week before turning to the news at hand, until finally he announced: "winter comming fast on, and Aulicus growing thin of wit . . . he took cold the last week, and kept his chamber, . . . he is now come abroad though very weake. . . . I thinke shortly we shall hear of his Funeralls; I shall onely desire they may winde up his body in one of his own sheetes, and that he may go to the ground like himselfe; and this I shall say of him when he is dead, That I have read as ingenious fallicies in him, as in any of his Majesties Declarations."

The Puritan papers of London plainly reflected the enthusiasm of the city, and until 1647 even the sale of royalist papers was hardly tolerated on the streets. When the King asked for a conference over the difficulties at Brentford, Parliament decided "to spend no more time in making replyes to his Maiestie concerning the treaty," for the royalists aimed simply "to spin out time, whereby they may weary us out and spend the stock of the Kingdome, untill such time as they shall receive their supplyes from Holland, which they daily expect, and so much brag of." The soldiers under Essex, with as much determination, declared "that many dayes shall not passe them before they will give the Kingdom a sufficient token of their forwardnesse." And this promise "so farr enlivened the Citizens of London, that they are resolved to assist the Parliament with their lives and fortunes." Accordingly, they brought "money and plate into Guild-Hall with extraordinary freenesse"; forwarded "great store of bread and cheese, meat tobacco and other things to the Army"; and resolved that Essex "shall not want moneys so long as their estates last." For these "large disbursements" Parliament thanked the city and promised restitution from the malignants' estates.[4]

Other Puritan news-books, however, compel us to discount somewhat this estimate of the city's generosity. Only a few days later *A Perfect Diurnall* (No. 26) reported that several parishes in London had not subscribed their quotas "for pay money for souldiers and Arms." At once church wardens and constables were ordered to assemble the delinquents and "to deale effectually with them to subscribe for the furthering of Arms and money for payment of Souldiers." The officials were further authorized to "repaire to the houses and places of aboad of such as shall not appeare at such meeting as well free men as others, and take their subscriptions for the purposes aforesaid and that they keepe a booke or roll for that purpose." As an additional source of revenue the Commons also agreed

[4] *A Continuation,* no. 21, December 1, 1642.

on an "Excise upon Wine Beare Tobacco, and severall other unnecessary commodities," and the saving of "a meales meat once a week" was even proposed as "a good way to raise a stock of moneys for the army" (No. 30). Assuredly, there is nothing new under the sun. When opposition was raised against such levies, compulsion was resorted to. The assessors, it is said, "this day made distraine in divers places in London, and tooke away the wares and goods of two woolen drapers in Paules Church-yard in London, and some others that refused to pay their assessements, and carried the same to Guild-hall to be sould to pay the same" (No. 33).

Prices apparently rose with the taxes. There is record, for example (No. 34), of "a complaint made to the Commons this day of the inhancing of the price of Coales, that since the restraint of the ships going to Newcastle, the price of Coales is raysed from 22 shillings a Chaldron, to 34 shillings." Consequently, the House agreed on "setting of a certaine price upon Coales." Still the opposition to the war increased, it seems, as the burdens pressed more heavily on all, and "many of the City malignants which hath hitherto stood as Newters" framed a petition for an immediate peace. The author complains that these people were ready to sacrifice "our Religion, our Lawes and liberties with all that we may prosperously call ours," in their desire "that all things shall be concluded in peace, & things reduced to the ancient custome when they lived in prosperity." We recognize these pacifists from their descendants. "They came up and down the Citie to draw on others to be of their faction," and when the Lord Mayor ordered them to desist, they "insolently pressed the same." They even attempted to hold a public meeting in the Guild-Hall, into which they forced their way. But (No. 26) Captain Harvey rode up with his troopers, and "at the sound of his trumpet they were all scared away . . . and escaped apprehending at this time." The news-writer, however, declared that "many of the chiefe Ringleaders are knowne whose names are certified to the L. Mayor, who will take a speedy course with them." In less than two

weeks no less representative a citizen than Sir Paul Pindar was forced to confess his share in the agitation (No. 28).

Such discontents as these were eagerly seized by the royalists and possibly exaggerated. *Mercurius Aulicus* reported in January, 1643, that the army of Essex "was behind no lesse then five weekes pay," and that Parliament had emptied the treasury and, "contrary to all rules of housewiferie, left not an egge in the nest for the henne to sit on." A little later it predicted mutiny in the city as a result of Parliament's arbitrary assessments. Several instances of such tyrannical exaction are given with a due amount of gloating (No. 8): "A poorer widow, having a charge of five children, and her estate not worth above 200 l. . . . being not able to make present payment, was plundered of her Jack, Spits, and leaden Cistern, which was all the distresse [in the legal sense] that could be found in the house." Again, it is said that on a certain Sunday, following the afternoon service, the soldiers, "accompanied with Daniel the preaching Cobler of Grubstreet, whom the people call the prophet Daniel," went to the vestry of Saint Giles by Cripplegate and took the poor money from the box. Finally, this wholesale depredation is recorded: "Cloath to a good vallue had been taken from one Price a Draper; 10. chests of Sugar from one Grimes a Grocer; and 900 l. of other mens money from a Scrivener: besides which violent taxations and intolerable pressures there were some every day imployed in going from house to house to know what men would give of their owne accord towards the maintainance of the Warre."

In London, where this one royalist journal could not be sold safely on the streets, less notice was given to these confiscations. Possibly the spectacular phases of warfare suited better the public taste than these prosaic means of maintenance. After the King's approach on London in 1642, which Milton commemorated in his half-defiant sonnet, the streets were fortified against a similar danger in the future. In various sources accounts of these preparations are to be found. In May, 1643, *A Perfect Diurnall* announced, what the citizens must have

known, that "the Intrenching of the Citty round goes on with wonderous great speed, many thousands going out dayly to the Worke" (No. 30). Each day, one infers, certain trades or guilds assumed the responsibility; for the news continues: "On Tuesday last there went about 5000 Feltmakers and Cappers, neare upon three Thousand Porters, besides other great Companies of men, women and children," with "divers other Companies of the Trayned Bands and new Militia that goe out dayly to the Workes with their Drumms and Coullors in the usual way." While these activities were at their height, William Lithgow, the adventurous Scot, was in the city, and found everywhere "new barrocaded posts . . . strongly girded with great chaines of yron."[5] He saw the builders of the defences "marching to the fields and out works . . . with great alacritie, carrying on their shoulders yron mattocks and wooden shovels; with roaring drummes, flying colours, and girded swords." On one day the tailors went out, with forty-six colors and eight thousand "lusty men." On another day "a thousand oyster wives advanced from Billingsgate through Cheapside to Crabtree field, all alone, with drummes and flying collours." Fear and what is now called the psychology of the crowd gave impetus to these "daily musters" that Lithgow found "wondrous commendable"; but even he noticed, too, that the city was filled with "a general muttering that money is hard to come by."

Reports of the distant movements of the armies, of battles and sieges, were not so easily secured by the authors as these stories of London's unrest, and for that reason they must have been still more eagerly read. The general interest in the fate of Gloucester has already been shown. The stories printed of other such engagements disclose to the modern world, which is now learning so many new lessons, what military science was like in the seventeenth century.

In 1643 Prince Rupert attacked Chichester. "Whilst his Ordnance," the *Diurnall* reported, "was playing against one

[5] *The Present Surveigh of London.* In Somers Tracts, vol. iv, pp. 534-545.

end of the Towne, he with a party of horse went to the other end, and made assault against it, shooting Grenadoes to set fire of the Barnes and Thatched houses that were at that end." Elsewhere, a fuller picture is given, in Cromwell's own words, of the Puritans' skirmish near Newark in 1643. His official report ran in the *Diurnall:* "God hath given us this evening a glorious victory over our enemies, they were as we are enformed one and twentie Colours of horse troops and three or foure of dragoones; it is late in the evening when we drew out, they came and faced us within two miles of the town, so soon as we had the alarum we drew out our forces consisting of about twelve troops, whereof some of them so poore and broken that you shall seldome seen worse; with this handfull it pleased God to cast the scale, for after we had stood a little above musket shot the one body from the other, and the Dragooners having fired on both sides for the space of halfe an hour or more, they not advancing towards we agreed to charge them, and advancing the body after many shots on both sides, came with our Troopes a pretty round trot, they standing firme to receive us, and our men charging fiercely upon them, they were immediately routed and ran all away, and wee had the execution of them two or three miles." When this communication was penned, Cromwell must have been still hot from the combat, with no more care for the elegancies of style than Hotspur had. But for that reason the picture he gives of the open battles of that day, when the cavalry played the decisive part, is to be taken as typical of all.

The next year Rupert was at Newark, and another story was to be told. The city was besieged by a Puritan force, consisting of four thousand foot soldiers and two thousand horse. The King's nephew was ordered to ride to its relief. With his small detachment he was able to slip up unobserved within eight miles of the town. The next morning at nine the Prince himself led the charge, and the fight "grew sturdy," for the rebel army "disputed it toughly." Rupert himself, "having pierced deep into the Enemies, and being observed for his

Valour, was dangerously at once assaulted by three sturdy Rebells, whereof one fell by his Highnesses own sword, a second being pistolled by M. Mortaine one of his own Gentlemen; the third now ready to lay hand on the Princes Coller had it almost chopt by Sir William Neale." In the end the Puritans surrendered, and Rupert took as booty three thousand muskets, eleven brass cannon, one of them four yards in length, and a great quantity of pikes and muskets.

Besides these detailed accounts of pitched battles, the journals often give descriptions of sieges and storming parties. The small news-books could print only a brief account of these protracted operations, and the full story was often published afterward in a larger pamphlet. But the journals themselves were in appearance small books, and the only distinction between the journal and the pamphlet was that of continuity. The interesting little book, therefore, entitled *A True Relation of the Storming of Bristoll,* was close kin to the journals under discussion, and the affair was one of major importance in the history of the war. As a revelation of the methods of the day, it is of significance here.

The story opens with Fairfax's call on Rupert for surrender. "Sir, For the Service of the Parliament I have brought their Army before the City of Bristol, and do Summon You in their Names, to Render it with all Forts belonging to the same into my hands, to their use." Immediately came the Prince's laconic answer: "I received yours by your Trumpeter: I desire to know, whether you will give me leave to send a Messenger to the King, to know his pleasure in it." To this request Fairfax sent his refusal, while "everything was prepared for a Storme; the Souldiers had their faggots on their backs, and leaped for joy they might go on." When Rupert's reply was delivered the next day, it proved to be unsatisfactory. As the first of seventeen conditions he stipulated that he, his troops, and the citizens be permitted to leave the city "with their Arms, flying Coulours, Drums beating, Trumpets sounding, Pistolls cock'd, Swords drawn, Matches lighted at both ends, Bullets in their mouths,

and as much Powder and Match as they can carry about them; with all their Bag and Baggage, Horses, Arms, and other Furniture, ten pieces of Cannon, Fifty barrels of Powder, Match and Bullet proportionable." A fire insurance policy could hardly be more comprehensive; but, although the other sixteen conditions were just as specific, Fairfax found them "doubtfully expressed" and suspected that Rupert was delaying until "his Counterscarfes and inner lines" were finished. So all negotiations were broken off.

The assault was carefully planned. "Collonel Weldon, with His Brigade, consisting of the four Taunton Regiments, . . . whose Posts were to make good Somersetshire side, was ordered to storme in three places, viz. two hundred men in the middle, two hundred on each side, (as forlorn hopes) to begin the storme, twenty Ladders to each place, two men to carry each Ladder, and to have five shillings a peece, two Serjeants that attend the service of the Ladder, to have 20 shillings a man; each Musquettier that follows the Ladder, to carry a faggot, a Serjeant to command them, and to have the same reward; 12 Files of men, with fire, armes, and pikes, to follow the Ladders to each place . . . to be commanded each by a Captaine, and Lieutenant; the Lieutenant to goe before with five Files, the Captaine to second him, with the other seven Files; the two hundred men that are appointed to second the storme, to furnish each partie of them, twenty Pyoneers, who are to march in their Reare. . . . Those Pyoneers are to throw down the Lyne, and make way for the Horse: the partie that is to make good the Line, to possesse the Guns, and turn them. A gentleman of the Ordnance, Gunners, and Matrosses, to enter with the parties, the Draw-bridge to be let down, two Regiments and a halfe of Horse, to storme in, (after the foot) if way be made."

On Tuesday night, September 9, all was thus put in readiness. "The signes were to be, to give notice when the storme should begin, by kindling a fire of straw, and shooting off foure great Guns," and "the Word during the storme, was David: the word after the Lyne was entered, was The Lord of Hosts."

In less than an hour after the advance was made, Prior's Fort was taken, by means of scaling ladders, and cannon were planted against the castle. Then Rupert surrendered, and the terms of capitulation were drawn up.

Although the Civil War in England was much less barbarous than the conflict in Ireland, charges of atrocity were freely brought against both Puritans and Royalists. Prince Rupert was apparently the most dreaded of the Cavaliers, and items like this are frequent in the news-books. "There came Letters from Northampton on Monday last, by which it was certainly informed that Prince Rupert with at least 2000 horse is in that County, and makes great spoyle there, having plundered many places thereabouts."[6] And again at Chichester, Prince Rupert was reported to have taken as booty "two thousand horse, with which he made his footmen Troopers, six hundred head of Cattell, and about sixty Cart-loade of plunder." His soldiers also "tooke pure Holland Sheets, and foulded them up under their Saddles, with which when they tooke up their lodgins they covered their horses withall instead of Horse-cloathes," and, having entered the town, "laid about them in that inhumaine manner it would grieue a Jew to heare the Relation." In another place, "much enraged at their losses," they "put all to the sword they met withall both men women and children, and in a barbarous manner murthered three Ministers our godly and religious men."

So persistent were these charges that the royal trooper was forced to publish his defence. His spirited "Declaration" began with an apology for his appearance as an author, his "known disposition being so contrary to this scribling age." But the charges of barbarity forced him to declare: "I take that man to be no Souldier or Gentleman, that will strike (much lesse kill) a woman or a child." He defied his accusers to name the persons inhumanely treated by him, or the places where such atrocities had been committed. Finally, in retaliation, he reminded his readers of the sacking of the Earl of Northampton's

[6] *A Continuation,* no. 30, February 2, 1643.

house by the Roundheads, their destruction of churches, and the imprisonment of innocent persons. He pledged his word, too, that, if Charles were received in London peacefully, no citizen need fear plunder, and closed with the knightly words: "And so, whether peace or warre, the Lord prosper the worke of their hands who stand for God and King Charles."

The royalist press in general supported the charges that Rupert here brought against the Puritan soldiery. In May, 1643, appeared the first number of a paper amply entitled, *Mercurius Rusticus, or the Countries complaint of the Murthers, robberies, plundrings, and other outrages committed by the Rebells on his Majesties faithfull subjects.* It told in full of the sacking of Sir John Lucas' house, and the outrages on its inmates. Another paper, *Mercurius Aulicus,* found an even more barbarous story to tell. "The Rebels," it declared, "speed so ill at downright fighting, that now they practise a new way of Murther, for we are certainly advertised from Dennington Castle, that when the Rebells close besieged that place, they hired a Souldier to poyson their Well. . . . This Souldier having informed the Rebells, that the Well was most necessary for supportation of that Garrison, received his 20 shillings . . . and in the night time conveyed the Poyson downe the Well. But next morning their Commander (toucht it seems with the horror of the fact) sent a Drum with a Letter to Sir John Boys to give notice what was done. . . . After which time, he kept the Well in despight of the Rebels, and to make tryall whether or no the Well were truly poysoned, he tryed the experiment upon an Horse, which having drank of it, swelld and dyed within 24 houres."

One of the last pieces of important news that these journals had to communicate before their suppression, was the execution of the King in 1649. The *Moderate Intelligencer* followed most fully the proceedings against Charles. Like the rest, it was a paper about five by six and a half inches in size. In it the news from England was as a rule printed first; then letters from the Continent were given; and often at the very end the

notice of a new book was added, such as "A Continuation of Mr. John-Amos Comenius School-Endeavours, or a summary delineation of Doctor Cyprian Kinner Silesian his Thoughts concerning Education, Way and Method of Teaching, comes forth tomorrow."

In the issue of the *Moderate Intelligencer* for the week ending January 4, 1649, appeared the item: "An Ordinance was this day brought in, which is in way of Commission, in which certaine persons about 100 in number, Lords, Commons, Citizens, & others are qualified, with power to try the Kings Majesty." This bill, having been read a second time the next day, was referred to the committee for the insertion of "the names of such as were to be Commissioners therein." The King himself felt little concern at this step, if the editor was truly informed, for the report continues: "The King is merry, discourses upon subjects purporting a life of many dayes here, doubts not but within six moneths to see peace in England." Yet the plans for the trial went on, and "the Commons understanding how unanimously the Lords had gone against the Commission for tryall of the King, agreed to proceed themselves."

In the next issue of the paper the author discussed the three possible forms of government, whether by king, by Lords and Commons, or by the Commons alone, "which," he added "de facto it's now comming to." He explained that the word king, "as they that understood the Saxon Language say, signifies no more but cunning." In an unlimited monarchy, therefore, "a cunning or wise man is set over the people by their consent, because cunning, to see to their preservation." This line of argument seems to be leading to the conclusions soon to be propounded by Milton in *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*. But here the author halted. Even were it necessary, he felt, for a king to be deposed, the divine rule is not to visit the sins of the fathers upon the children "unlesse they walke in the steps of their Fathers." Hence the line of succession should hardly be changed. In this article and the next the author appears plainly

in the capacity of a modern editor to influence the judgment of his readers.

Soon, however, the editor resigned this function and dropped back into the rôle of news-writer to report the progress of events. Although the clergymen of Oxfordshire and others submitted petitions against a continuance of the prosecution, and although the Prince of Wales promised, if his father's life were spared, to see that Parliament's wishes were fulfilled, the proceedings went on. The House voted "that the King had exercised tyrannical government, was a tyrant, a Murtherer and Traitor" and agreed "to draw up the sentence of condemnation against him," ordering in advance that it should be counted "high treason for any person or persons to proclaim any King of England without consent of Parliament."

On the 27th final sentence accordingly was pronounced. The King was brought before the Lord President and the sixty-seven commissioners present. They forbade his speaking "against the jurisdiction of the Court," but allowed him to plead in his own defence. So Charles began: "I must tell you, that this many a day all things have been taken away from mee, that I call dearer to me than my life, which is my Conscience and my Honor." His aim, he declared, in speaking was not to save his life, but to insure peace to the country. With that end only in view, he asked to "be heard in the Painted Chamber before the Lords and Commons." This request was denied, on the ground that Charles sought only delay, of which there had been too much already, and that "Judges are no more to delay then they are to deny Justice." The king still urged his plea, arguing that "a little delay of a day or two farther may give peace, whereas an hasty judgement may bring on that trouble and perpetuall inconvenience to the kingdome, that the childe that is unborn may repent." But the Lord President remained obdurate, arguing, as Milton did, that the oath at coronation was proof of a contract between king and people, and that Charles had violated the contract. The clerk then read the sentence, ending with the words: "For all which Treasons

and Crimes this Court doth adjudge, That he the said Charles Stuart, as a Tyrant, Traytor, Murtherer, and a publike Enemy, shall be put to death, by the severing of his Head from his Body."

Since the measures against royalist papers were then very strict, the author had to give these facts without comment of his own. Some sympathy for the royal martyr seems to lie beneath the few facts that are given to conclude the story. The author reviewed the troubled reign of Charles, attributing the evil done chiefly to the Catholic marriage. He mentioned next a few of the touching incidents from the last hours of the King,—the sending away of his dogs and his last words to his children. Then he told how Charles walked through the park to the scaffold and spoke there, behind the black-draped railing, to the small group of persons gathered to witness his end, before he finally gave a few of his personal belongings to his faithful friends and laid his head upon the block. It "was at one blow struck off by one in disguise, and taken up by another in disguise." The author then concluded with this expressive comment: "Thus have you from first to last of this Tragoedie, such particulars as could be got from severall hands. Many have said, and possible true, wilfulnesse hath chiefly occasioned what hath befallen."

The execution of King Charles brings one close to the end of this first flourishing period of English journalism. As early as 1647 the strictest measures were taken by the Puritans in control toward the suppression of the royalist papers in London. The old women who hawked them about the streets were whipped by the constables if they were caught. Then in 1651 Milton himself, the author of the grandest plea for the freedom of the press, became a sort of licensing editor of *Mercurius Politicus*. The Restoration led at once to the complete suppression of all papers but the one licensed by the new king's servant and to the establishment of the *Gazette*. Nevertheless, the progress of English journalism during Puritan days had been rapid, though short. The editors, or authors, as they were

usually called, had learned to gather the news and get it before the people; they had learned, too, that the press is a potent factor in the influencing of public opinion. The history of English journalism had begun.

FAMILIAR LETTERS

UNTIL the beginning of the eighteenth century, at least, the letter as a form of literature held a position of importance that it possibly never can regain. All through the Middle Ages and the Renaissance there were the same commercial and political occasions for correspondence as exist today. Many personal and social interests, also, different somewhat from ours but just as vital, necessitated letter-writing; manuscripts, for example, were lent by one monastery to another, friends were introduced, gifts were dispatched, always with some form of epistolary greeting. Hence as early as the ninth century, a skill in correspondence was one accomplishment demanded of churchmen.[1] But the letter in olden time had other services to render that are no longer exacted of it. While newspapers were unknown, letters afforded about the only medium, word-of-mouth excepted, of transmitting news. To the same extent, the letter took the place of essay, novel, and argumentative treatise. So used, it of course was addressed not to a particular person alone, but to a wide public. Authors were careful to preserve copies of what they sent to personal friends, and sooner or later their opinions were the property of all who read. Style, therefore, was essential to the letter. It should be newsy or thoughtful; it should be correct in form; but further, if it was to win a lasting attention, it had to be well phrased and artistically ordered.

To leave so essential an art uncodified, open to the random efforts of all aspirants, was not the practice of the Middle Ages. Scholars had long held in high esteem the treatises on the orator and oratory left them as an heritage by Cicero and Quintilian. Just as essential seemed the collections of sermons and the systems of homiletics that standardized that art. All phases of

[1] G. Steinhausen, *Geschichte des deutschen Briefes*. Berlin, 1889, p. 4.

social life, also, were subjected to the same process of codification. Naturally, then, letter writing was reduced to a carefully organized system. First, numerous collections by Cicero, Seneca, Pliny, and the Italian humanists were compiled and copied again and again. Later, treatises and textbooks on epistolography appeared. These books of rule were not based, as one might suppose, on the earlier collections of letters; instead, the theory was simply an adaptation of the already accepted principles of oratory.[2] Teachers of correspondence flourished, and in the schools established by Charlemagne the *ars dictaminis,* as it was called, made up a part of the curriculum. The theories meanwhile grew more rigid, until finally the formula for the model letter devised by Alberich of Monte-Cassino in the ninth century was universally accepted. A letter henceforth had to follow this order: *salutatio, captatio, narratio, petitio,* and *conclusio.*[3]

One of the best-known formularies of letter-writing was the *De Ratione Conscribendi Epistolas Liber* by Erasmus.[4] It was based on earlier models, and contained not only a statement of principles but specimens illustrative of each class discussed. The author classified letters according to their subject in these groups: persuasive, encomiastic, judicial, demonstrative, and familiar. Each class was then subdivided. Familiar letters, for example, may deal in news, gossip, congratulation, lament, request, courtesies, or mirth. But in any case, the letter, like the oration, is to be arranged in this sequence: *exordium, narratio, propositio, confirmatio, conjuratio,* and *peroratio.* For each sort Erasmus gave an example and inserted also some chapters of a general nature, such as "Peculiaris Epistolae Character." In its completeness and rigidity the treatise well represents the class to which it belongs.

Two other scholars as well known in their own day as Eras-

[2] N. Valois, *De Arte Scribendi Epistolas.* Paris, 1880.

[3] L. Rockinger, *Ueber Briefsteller und Formelbücher in Deutschland während des Mittelalters.* München, 1861, pp. 7, 10.

[4] In *Opera Omnia,* 10 vols., Lugduni Batavorum, 1703, vol. 1.

mus, Vives and Macropedius, compiled similar formularies. They begin with a definition of the letter and then proceed to a discussion of its several varieties and the proper ordering of its parts. Even more stereotyped are the shorter formularies, such as Christopher Hegendorff's *Methodus Conscribendi Epistolas,* which reads almost like a catechism.[5] The first question, "Quid est Epistola," calls for the orthodox definition, "Epistola est sermo absentis ad absentem." To the second question, "Quur inuenta," the response is, "Ut faceremus certiores absentes, si quid esset, quod eos scire, aut nostra, aut ipsorum interesset."[5] So the treatise proceeds, by question and answer, through all the topics rigidly prescribed for the formulary.

Yet these books were designed to give practical help to the inexperienced who in business or social intercourse found correspondence a necessity. Unquestionably, the service was well rendered, for otherwise the formulary would never have been popular. Its fundamental rigidity insured its usefulness. Furthermore, sufficient freedom was allowed. All teachers of correspondence stressed the need of simplicity and directness. And although the chief parts of an epistle were fixed beyond question, considerable latitude was allowed in the ordering of material, especially in the familiar letter. Erasmus would permit greater freedom here than in the oration, and even advised the concealment of any formal plan. As long as some lovers beg, others flatter, and still others expostulate, he professed to see no unalterable rule; it suffices for the familiar letter to be simple, clear, and brief.[6] Vives allowed just as much liberty in the arrangement of the body of the letter, for Cicero, he realized, passed from one subject to another, lightly and abruptly as they came to mind.[7] Macropedius called it stupid to hamper too much the freedom of the familiar letter.[8]

[5] All three, with two others, are found in A. Brandolini's *De Ratione Scribendi,* Frankfort, 1568.

[6] *Opera Omnia,* vol. 1, cap. 29, 55, 71.

[7] *De Conscribendis Epistolis,* p. 318.

[8] *Methodus,* p. 548.

These formularies, as they were called, passed from Italy, where they flourished first, to other countries. The earliest extant English treatise, William Fulwood's *Enimie of Idlenesse,* consists of four books. In the first, Fulwood laid down the rules for correct correspondence, with illustrations composed by himself. In the second book he selected from Angelo Poliziano's *Illustrium Virorum Epistolae* twenty-three, in later editions twenty-six, model letters. The third book contains a similar selection of epistles bearing on home life, and the fourth contains twelve or sixteen love letters.[9] The author's purpose was "to place down such precepts and set forth such instructions as may . . . best serve to evifie the ignorant;" for it was not "the cunning clarke" but "the unskillful scholer" that needed the instruction. Hence he was very explicit in giving directions for the proper placing of the subscription, which was regulated at right, centre, or left, by the social status of the person addressed. His illustrations are sufficiently full and varied to fit almost any situation. But on diction, like most of the professors of the *ars dictandi,* he wrote sensibly: "in fine, reteyne this for a principle that the best language that may bee, is the common and familiar speech and not that of rare and diffused phrases, or inck-horne termes, skummed from the Latine, nor of too base termes and barbarous, or termes unknowen except in certaine places, for there is nothing more decent than to keep a meane in all thinges." Possibly Fulwood realized his expectation of providing both help and amusement; for his book reached its seventh edition before the close of the century.

Another very influential formulary was Angel Day's *The English Secretorie,* which was modeled closely after the treatise of Erasmus. The author demonstrated first that the diction of a letter should be choice and apt, its content brief and direct,

[9] The source book used by Fulwood was discovered by P. Wolter, *The Enimie of Idlenesse, Der älteste englische Briefsteller.* Potsdam, 1907, p. 36. The first edition was issued by Fulwood in 1568.

and its material well ordered. "Seeing an Epistle hath cheiflie his definition here of, in that it is tearmed the familiar and mutuall talke of one absent freinde to another: it seemeth the character thereof, shoulde according thereunto bee simple, plaine, and of the lowest and meanest stile, vtterly deuoid of any shadow of hie and loftie speaches."[10] Day, however, did not fail to classify rigidly the different types of letter and to specify their several divisions. Nevertheless, he granted a considerable freedom to the familiar letter. He held that it was written "for fashions sake, custome, dutie, curtesie, or other familiaritie," with the purpose of conveying "a pleasant conceit, or some other more district or severe motion" rather than "any extraordinarie cause, forme, or substance."[11] Hence a certain indulgence should be accorded it that other more logical forms of composition may not claim.

This conflict between precise rule and freedom is plainly visible in the specimens inserted by Day. In the margins the different parts of each letter are labeled and the rhetorical devices used for amplification, whether figures of speech or what, are noted. But amid all this formality, some of the letters in themselves are interesting. As admonition, Day urges a youth to marry, and dissuades a young collegian from pursuing his idle amusements. In one model a son begs forgiveness of his father, and in another a servant is recommended to a nobleman. Yet another was "pleasantly written to a man who had buried his olde wife." Day, as well as Fulwood, wished to interest as well as guide, and they together exerted a wide influence on even their most gifted followers.[12]

But one must remember that these formularies appeared in Italy later than the collections of model letters, and that they were written or prepared, as Fulwood's was, chiefly for the uneducated or imperfectly trained. In England letter writers of any degree of literary skill went back to the classical authors

[10] *English Secretorie,* 1607, pp. 2, 8.
[11] *Ibid.,* p. 8.
[12] See below Sir John Suckling's imitation of this letter, p. 123.

and the Italian humanists for their patterns, and their own style and methods were directed by the best practice rather than by theory. Donne was simply expressing the commonly accepted views when he wrote to a friend:

"What treasures of Morall knowledge are in Senecaes Letters to onely one Lucilius? and what of Naturall in Plinies? how much of the storie of the time, is in Ciceroes Letters? And how all of these times, in the Jesuites Eastern and Western Epistles? where can we finde so perfect a Character of Phalaris, as in his own Letters? . . . The Evangiles and Acts, teach us what to beleeve, but the Epistles of the Apostles what to do. And those who have endevoured to dignifie Seneca above his worth, have no way fitter, then to imagine Letters between him and S. Paul. . . . The Italians, which are most discursive, and think the world owes them all wisdome, abound so much in this kinde of expressing, that Michel Montaigne saies, he hath seen, (as I remember) 400 volumes of Italian Letters."[13] These, in brief, are the chief models followed by English men of letters.

To discuss in detail the great Roman letter writers would be beyond the possible scope of this paper, and to go much farther than Donne's suggestions might indeed be superfluous. Surely, in Cicero's letters there is "the storie of the time." He wrote always to impart news, and each epistle is a little miscellany. But with what grace and animation he handled his material. He distinguished three kinds of letters,—letters of news, letters of pleasant, familiar chat, and letters on grave, moral topics.[14] But whatever theme he handled, Cicero passed deftly and briskly from one thought to another, always with the affairs of the moment uppermost. "I am sure you want to hear what is going on," he remarks; "what else do you want to know," he inquires; or he simply adds, "I am sure you want to hear about myself," and "you want to know how I behaved," and

[13] *Letters To Severall Persons of Honour.* 1651. C. E. Merrill, ed. New York, 1910, pp. 91-92.

[14] To Caius Curio. Erasmus, mentioning this letter, justifies his adding a fourth. *De Ratione Conscribendi Epistolas,* cap. 31 and 32.

"to wind up with family matters." In such hands the letter actually became the living thing that Cicero declared it to be.[15] "What a lot of nonsense is talked about 'viva vox,' " he exclaimed. "Why, I learned a dozen times as much about affairs from your letter as from his talk—the daily chit-chat, the designs of Publius, Juno's war-cries, how Athenio is raising the standard, his letter to Gnaeus, the conversation with Theophanes and Memmius: and you have made me wild with inquisitiveness about that 'fast' dinner." In such correspondence as this English authors found their true patterns.

Seneca's letters are quite different. The fact from his life or his correspondent's life with which each begins, serves only as a point of departure; for the letters are in reality moral essays. Seneca wrote to persuade his friend Lucilius of the value of Stoic philosophy. By self-control become the master of your time. A soul well ordered is settled and unfaltering. There can be no poverty where there is no discontent. We should eat only to appease hunger, drink only to quench thirst, and provide house and clothing only for protection. Old age is full of sweetness to him who knows how to enjoy it. Keep a middle course and ask no favors of Fortune.[16] Such is the advice of Seneca. He wrote finely on the choice of friends, on the language of the rhetorician and philosopher, on death, on the bearing of misfortune, and on the futility of seeking happiness in travel.[17] Each letter is a perfect little moral treatise, to which authors like Bacon would often turn.

But in addition to all this Seneca often expressed his thoughts on epistolary style. To Lucilius' criticism he answered that he wrote as he spoke, without effort, since letters ought not to be studied or artificial. He left all artifice of appeal to orators, and sought only to present his thoughts sincerely and plainly, without useless ornament or platitude. A letter, Seneca believed, ought like a portrait to bring to mind very personally

[15] *Letters to Atticus,* 2, 12. Loeb Classical Library.
[16] *Letters,* 1, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15.
[17] The theme of Goldsmith's *Traveller.*

an absent friend. So he praised Lucilius for the aptness and precision of his style, and defended Fabianus on the same ground.[18] Such critical opinion, mixed in as it is in really artistic letters, could be more easily and confidently followed by literary men than mere precept conveyed with none of the graces of art.

Yet even more directly the correspondence of Pliny the Younger must have influenced the familiar letters of later times. He wrote not for his correspondent alone, but for a wider public, in the hope that his work might win lasting fame for him. To him life was interesting in all its phases, as it must be to the author of familiar letters. Hence he has preserved a fine picture of Roman life, chiefly in the days of Trajan. "Oh, I have been attending a coming-of-age function; I was at a betrothal or a wedding; so-and-so asked me to witness the signing of a will; I have been acting as witness to A, or I have been in consultation with B. . . . What a number of days I have frittered away in these chilly formalities."[19] From the business of the crowded law courts, or the vulgar exhibitions at the public games, Pliny hurries us to the literary readings and the social dinners. Behind it all the reader is conscious of a quiet, meditative mind alert to all that passed.

Pliny's social picture was strongly colored by his own personality, for no two pictures of the same society could be more different than his and Juvenal's.[20] He saw "the din, the idle chatter, and the frivolous occupations" of the city, yet he spoke also of its brighter life—of friends, of domestic happiness, of faithful slaves, and of the peace of country living. To all he was kindly and sympathetic, save possibly to the despised barrister, Regulus, with his sham and love of notoriety.

Pliny in his letters has all the self-complacency of James Howell and something of the snobbishness of Walpole. If he

[18] *Letters*, 75, 40, 59, 100.

[19] *The Letters of the Younger Pliny*. Translated by J. B. Firth, 2 vols. London, n. d., vol. 1, p. 9.

[20] See S. Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*. London, 1904.

founded a school or erected a temple, he carefully let his left hand know all about it. To a host he said nicely, "I get more thoroughly and attentively looked after by your servants than I do by my own"; but he hastened to spoil his compliment by adding, "You will very likely find the same thing yourself when you come to stay in one of my villas." With the same self-content he praised two young lawyers whose demeanor in his court had pleased him—especially "the way in which they kept looking up to me." With such guileless remarks he has left behind the suspicion that he praised others readily because he hoped for applause himself.[21]

Just a touch of snobbishness is noticeable in Pliny. He greatly preferred the quiet and the leisurely procedure of the courts in former days, and felt that "all the other advocates are bumptious, and for the most part young men of no standing." Indeed, he professed that "only a desire to save my friends and my age . . . has induced me to go on practising so long."[22] But neither the complacency nor the aloofness of Pliny can spoil the charm of his letters. In his varied interests in life; in his frank display of personality; and especially in his long and sincere descriptions of country life at his villas, he shows himself very modern. There may be a touch of artificiality in his effort; but for all that he seems a most natural and intimate correspondent. The secret of his success is all summed up in what he says of his own letters: "I give you these details because I know you like to hear any news that is stirring, and besides, it is a pleasure to me to renew my gratification by writing and telling it to you."[23]

From the correspondence of Cicero, Seneca, and especially Pliny, to the familiar letters of the seventeenth century seems indeed but a slight step. But the sway of the formulary intervened, and the tradition was broken. Early churchmen, to be sure, wrote letters, but in altogether a new spirit. Augustine's

[21] *Letters*, 1. 4; 6. 11.
[22] *Ibid.*, 2. 14.
[23] *Ibid.*, 2. 17; 5. 6; 7. 24.

are in the main concerned with Scriptural exegesis; the one letter by Jerome that has interested me, that to his sister, belongs rather to the essay on the courtesy books than to this paper; only Basil wrote with anything of the old personal touch.[24]

Petrarch was the first modern man to break away from the yoke of the formulary and write interesting and personal letters of real intrinsic merit. They were written for the most part before the author knew anything of Cicero's correspondence, and not at all in imitation of Seneca or Pliny. The author in his letters simply expressed himself, as the old Romans had done. He wrote to many friends over a long period of years, and, although he kept careful copies, he was careless in preserving the dates. Consequently, his secretaries were sorely taxed when they came to arrange the letters for publication about the middle of the fourteenth century. But over five hundred have been printed, in four series: *De Rebus Familiaribus, Epistolæ Variæ, Epistolæ de Rebus Senilibus,* and *Epistolæ sine Titulo.*[25]

Each letter by Petrarch is a carefully written Latin essay; for all matters of a trivial or commonplace sort, handled in the vernacular, were relegated to the postscripts. His correspondents were numerous; he addressed epistles even to dead authors, like Cicero, Seneca, and Virgil. Yet he revealed himself to all so frankly and without reserve that the reader comes to know the many-sided humanist. Even to Cicero he wrote "as to a friend of my own years and time."[26] Letter writing was a rest and diversion for the often tired scholar. He gave the first modern example of the light chat about self—his studies, his travels, and the people he knew.

Other Italian humanists followed at once. Salutato wrote chiefly political and business letters after the model of Seneca

[24] See essay on Courtesy Books, p. 166.

[25] J. H. Robinson and H. W. Rolfe, *Petrarch. The First Modern Scholar and Man of Letters. A Selection from his Correspondence.* New York, 1914, pp. 153-154.

[26] *Petrarch's Letters to Classical Authors.* M. E. Cosenza, ed. Chicago, 1910.

and Petrarch. Poggio composed his letters easily and quickly in a simple, natural style, and seemingly cared so little for them that he kept no copies. Filelfo openly wondered that his friends valued his offerings; for he wrote without real care, in an unpolished style, on the simple matters that he was familiar with. Gasparino da Barzizza not only wrote letters himself, but compiled a collection of earlier letters for school use. Is it any wonder, then, that Montaigne could assert that he had seen over four hundred such volumes written by Italians alone? Yet countless numbers were lost, and many others have never been printed.[27]

Englishmen, also, during the reigns of the Tudor sovereigns were busy correspondents, as the numerous volumes published by learned societies and historical commissions amply witness. Most of these letters, however, dealing exclusively with men and affairs, and making no pretence to style, belong to another genre altogether than those of Seneca or Petrarch. These Tudor writers show no traces of Roman or Italian influence, and, excepting in whatever propriety they observe in salutation or subscription, no profit from the formulary. Their letters, therefore, belong to history rather than to literature. Occasionally, however, the writer's own personality takes a guiding hand and the letter becomes familiar. So John Chamberlain on first coming to London found "all fish that came to net" and "bestowed it as freely as it came." Later, after the novelty of his surroundings had worn off, he gathered less of interest, and his correspondent, Carleton, had to be "content with a shorter pittaunce." But if Chamberlain's letters are more interesting than many others, it is simply because he could infuse his own personality into matters of fact and find "such pettie reckennings . . . to make up a Summe."[28]

Often certain portions of the impersonal communications

[27] See G. Voigt, *Die Wiederbelebung des classischen Alterthums.* 2 vols. Berlin, 1893, vol. 2, pp. 417-436.

[28] *A Jacobean Letter-Writer. The Life and Times of John Chamberlain.* London, 1921, pp. 33, 63.

carry a strong individual touch. "I have taken all knowledge to be my province," Francis Bacon wrote to his uncle, Lord Burghley. Again, to Sir Toby Matthew he expressed the interesting idea, "these modern languages will at one time or other play the bankrupts with books." But no one knows the rest of either letter. Interesting, also, is Sir Philip Sidney's threat to Edward Molineux, "if ever I know you to do so much as read any letter I write to my father, without his commandment, or my consent, I will thrust my dagger into you."[29] One more example will suffice to show how a bare conveyance of fact can catch here and there the intimacy of familiar correspondence. Prince Charles, on learning of the illness of his tutor, the Earl of Newcastle, who with the Queen's aid had once forced the youth to take some medicine, added to his letter of condolence the roguish admonition, "I would not have you take too much Phisick: for it doth allwaies make me worse, and I think it will do the like with you."[30]

Some of these letters of affairs have preserved interesting evidence of life in university circles during the seventeenth century. Sir John Cheke informed a friend that he lacked "painted bucrum to lai betweyne bokes and bordes in mi studie," and begged him to fetch a ream of paper from London. In another Roger Ascham begged the privilege of returning to college life; for his travels had convinced him that "their is no soch quietnesse in England, nor pleasur in strange contres, as even in S. Jons Colledg to kepe company with the Bible, Plato, Aristotle, Demosthenes, and Tullie." To explain this preference, the fine-minded old scholar offered his defence of the liberal arts, the humanities, as the fountainhead of all other studies. Against the illiberal encroachments of the faculties of law, medicine, and divinity, he protested: "if som be not sufferd in Cambrige to make the fourth ordre, that is surelie as thei list, to studie the tonges and sciences, th' other three

[29] *Miscellaneous Works*. Boston, 1860, pp. 327-328.

[30] *Original Letters Illustrative of English History*. H. Ellis, ed. 3 vols. London, 1824, vol. 3, p. 287.

shall naythe be so many as thei shold, nor yet so good and perfitte as thei might." John Speed, Archbishop Usher, Sir Henry Spelman, and Sir Robert Cotton sent word back and forth of their pioneer excursions into Old English scholarship. John Speed, for example, asked Cotton not to make any notes on the proof of the *History of Great Britaine* that he was reading, but "to past a paper where you do adde," for he said "somewhere we cannot read your Notes." Then a little later John Strype, a boy at Jesus College, Cambridge, wrote home to his mother of the ways of the place. He sent one letter by his laundress, with the urgent request, "tell her how you would have my linen washed." He complained of the difficulty of finding a good room, he described the fare at the Commons, and explained why he, like all other students, was the victim of extortionate merchants. He had spent ten shillings for the horse on which he rode from London, ten more as part payment for a suit, and something for books. College life, apparently, was costing more than the Strypes had anticipated, but the boy promised to make the most of his opportunity.[31] And still another record of Cambridge life is found in the *Letter-Book* of Gabriel Harvey.[32] He was in such grim earnest that he saw no humor in the scene. But we can still picture it: the tolling bell, the lecture room slowly filling, the somewhat nervous Master of Arts at the desk ready for the Greek lecture at Pembroke College, and then the inrush of the angry proctor to "boy" the new master, whose degree he challenged "with manie . . . brags and malitius words," and to dismiss the pupils. Such letters, were they only more literary in spirit, would be familiar in the true sense of the word.

Although in these letters of Gabriel Harvey's there is no indication that he had studied the formularies, his theory of the letter was only what he might have learned from Angel

[31] *Original Letters of Eminent Literary Men.* Sir H. Ellis, ed. Camden Society, London, 1843, pp. 8, 14, 16, 109, 132, 176, 180, 181.

[32] *Letter-Book.* E. J. L. Scott, ed. Camden Society, London, 1884, pp. 47, 48, 76, *et passim.*

Day. Harvey considered it quite proper to retail "homelye ridiculous stuffe," since the writer's aim should be rather a "continuaunce of entier frendshipp and owlde acquayntaunce by familiar and good fellowly writinge, then affectinge the comendation of an eloquent and oratorlike style by overcurious and statelye endictinge." Such naturalness of expression had always been advocated in the formularies.

Roger Ascham unquestionably had more of the real gift for familiar correspondence. His long letters from Germany to his friends in St. John's College, from which his thoughts could not be absent long, are filled with interest and kindly observation. He begged a friend to take Charles Morrison's little son to his college rooms to "show the child some pleasure." He furnished clear and observant reports of his experiences on the Continent, and begged for news in return from St. John's. His loyalty to his friends, his love for the university, his keen interest in life, his generous, modest temperament—of these his letters are full.[33] Taking up the mantle left by Cicero, Pliny, and Petrarch, Ascham was one of the first real letter writers of the English Renaissance.[33]

Yet long after Ascham's time the formulary held its ground. The earliest books of the kind had been simply "complete letter writers," with no intermixture of precept or theory. In that respect Nicholas Breton's *A Poste with a Packet of Mad Letters* is simply a reversion to type. It appeared in 1603. That it was popular can be deduced from the fact that over twenty years later *A Speedie Poste* was published in imitation. The later book, we think, revealed the purpose of both: "newly published for the help of such as are desirous to learne to write Letters in Court, City, and Country." There were other books like them, all obviously designed to furnish models for correct and witty correspondence.

Breton's volume is filled with interesting anecdotes, clever jokes, and sharp, incisive phrases. At last the letter book had

[33] *The Whole Works of Roger Ascham.* 3 vols. London, 1865. See vol. 1, pp. 287, 302, 307, and vol. 2, pp. 243-271.

been taken under the care of skilled writers. Breton introduces us to a son writing gratefully to his father; to a gentleman admonishing a kinswoman to virtuous living; to a young man offering "comfortable advice" to a mourning friend. A jealous husband, also, mildly rebukes his erring wife, and receives in her "cunning answer" the pertinent advice to "shake off your lousie iealousie." Breton can be very courteous in *A Letter of Love to a Gentlewoman,* or impudent either to a "Coy Dame" or a "fowle Dowdy." What the dame in question neatly called the "huftie tuftie" of these two letters would render them seldom usable. There are in addition letters of news and a merchant's letter to his factor and the latter's reply, such as Angel Day had already given. Lastly, to cite but one more item, a wife reminds her husband in London "in any wise [to] remember your Girles Cawle, and your Boyes Hat."[34]

The style of the letters is as interesting as the content. It is concise and witty, with clever quips and balanced phrasing that show still the influence of *Euphues,* itself in part a complete letter writer. For a young courtier Breton's advice is: "Let mee entreat you a little now and then to looke to that which I counsell you: keepe your purse warily, and your credit charily, your reputation valiantly, and your honor carefully. . . . Goe neate, but not gay, lest it argue a lightnesse, and take heed of lauish expence, lest it begger thy state: play little, and lose not much, vse exercise, but make no toile of a pleasure: Read much, but dull not thy braine." The admonition seems so good that the young man answers: "Sweet Cousin, I thinke you haue either some Court in the Country, or else you have studied the Courtier, that you can set downe such rules that are no lesse worthy the reading, then observing."[35]

Despite this reference to Castiglione's work, Breton betrayed noticeably the middle-class prejudices that color many of the late English courtesy books. To a young man about to enter the University, Breton wrote disparagingly of grammar,

[34] Grosart's edition, pp. 10, 11, 15, 16, 24.
[35] *Ibid.,* p. 8.

logic, music, and astronomy, and advised, instead, a mastery of arithmetic "for him that meanes to gather wealth and grow rich." He admitted that divinity is essential, but advised caution in the pursuit of poetry, "lest it run away with thy wit." Still more bourgeois in sentiment is his eulogy of trade, addressed to a father who has just articled his son as an apprentice. "A right Merchant," Breton assured him, "is a royal fellow, hee is desirous to see much, to trauell much, and sometime to gaine a little doth aduenture much." As a result, "how manie poore do they relieue at home? what Colledges? what Hospitals? what Alms-houses haue they builded?"[36] The merchant class had been flattered before, but never more openly than here.

Although *A Poste with a Packet of Mad Letters* most nearly resembles the illustrative portions of the earlier formularies, other influences affected Breton. In *The Figure of Foure* he trifles cleverly with the number four, on over one hundred topics broached. "There bee foure expeciall poor Schollers," for example, "in the world: Petty-foggers, Quacksalvers, Ballad-makers, and A. B. C. Schoole-masters." Already the Spaniard Guevara in his eighteenth letter had answered certain questions in the same way. One example will suffice. To the query how to distinguish a good man from a bad, the four criteria are said to be, "what affaires he takes in hand, what works he doth, what wordes he speaketh, and what companie he followeth." Breton could hardly have failed to know Guevara's letters, for under the title *Golden Epistles* they were translated into English in 1577 by Geffrey Fenton, and exerted a wide influence. There is nothing surprising in Guevara's letters themselves. He wrote to console a nobleman who had lost his wife and to encourage a youth banished from Spain. Addressing the Duke of Alva on nobility he asserted that "the houses of good knightes ought to be as scholes of instruction to youth, & not Tauernes to professe epicuritie." He expressed himself again on education, and, to his sister, repeated the unfavorable views on court life that

[36] *A Poste with a Packet of Mad Letters,* pp. 36, 37, 41. See below Peacham's ideas on the dignity of trade.

fill his *Menosprecio de la Corte*. Even when he began by denying the theft of a pomander ball, he branched off soon into a homily on the text, "Yea, they are all bound rather to liue well then to smell sweete." So there is no great difference between the letters proper and the little discourses on religious subjects that are intermixed with them. At once the book won a great popularity not only with letter writers but with all interested in moral philosophy. For the letter as well as the essay, another model of proved worth had been added to the earlier patterns that Englishmen had always followed.[37]

Guevara contributed most, one may suppose, to the strengthening of the Senecan tradition in England, to the use of the letter form for didactic and moral purposes. What he said of the art itself had to do mainly with the form of the letters. "Always endeavour, Sir, when-ever you write, to keep your Lines streight, Letters even, Paper clean, Folding exact, and Seals clear." Because one correspondent lacked such tidiness, Guevara told him that he was better fitted for "dying Cordavant Felts" than for "writing either Bills or Bonds." Another letter came to him so cramped that he "took it rather for a Bill in Chancery preferr'd against me, than a Letter writ to me," and at last submitted the manuscript to various scholars to ascertain in what language it was written.[38]

Next in importance to the *Golden Epistles* were the letters in Portuguese of Antonio Pérez. But at the same time, also, English writers learned from the French the value of a polished and refined, even though somewhat artificial, style. The development of the letter as a literary form had been much the same in the two countries. During the early years of the seventeenth century the best letters in France, as in England, had been written by men of affairs, like Henry IV, François de

[37] *Golden Epistles*. Translated by Geffrey Fenton. London, 1577, pp. 3, 13, 58, 81, 117, 118.

[38] *Spanish Letters: Historical, Satyrical, and Moral; of the Famous Don Antonio de Guevara*. Translated by J. Savage, London, 1697. See Letters 7 and 12. James Howell imitated this last letter.

Sales, and Malherbe.[39] But in Paris the clientele of the Hotel Rambouillet made the letter a distinctly social, literary form before it was cultivated in that way at London. Earlier than that, Honoré d'Urfé had written his *Épîtres Morales* in imitation of Seneca. But Frenchmen in general felt that Balzac and Voiture were doing something new for the letter—giving it the true familiar tone.

Balzac's letters were published in 1624. Ten years later a partial English translation appeared, and only four years later a more complete translation was made by Sir Richard Baker.[40] Like many other familiar letter writers Balzac complained of the publicity given his letters. "I never meant," he professed, "they should gadde about the streets. By this meanes, when I thinke I am in my Closet, I finde my selfe upon the Stage; they carry me abroad, when I desire to be private, and what I intended an inclosure to my Friends, they lay in common for all the Country." Such violation of one's privacy seemed wrong to him, since "many things are entrusted to the bosome of Letters, which neither curiosity, nor hatred ought to prye into." Apparently, he tried to write simply and naturally; for he praised a friend who wrote in choice diction and clear phrase but without apparent straining for effect. "When I write to you," he remarked, "I leave my selfe to the conduct of my penne, and neither thinke of the dainties of our Court, nor of the severitie of our Grammar."[41] In general, Balzac did just this. There may be considerable artificiality in his style, judged by present standards; but he exposed without reserve his views of court life and public affairs, as well as all the little details of his personal life. So he furnished both precept and example for his followers in England.

[39] L. Petit de Julleville. *Histoire de la Langue et de la Littérature Française.* 6 vols. Paris, 1898, vol. 5, pp. 600 *et seq.* Montaigne's comments on letter writing are of interest (*Essays,* 1. 39).

[40] *The Letters of Mounsieur de Balzac. Translated into English, according to the last Edition by W. T. Esq.* London, 1634. *New Epistles of Mounsieur de Balzac. Translated by Sir Richard Baker.* London, 1638.

[41] *New Epistles,* 2, pp. 1-2; 3, pp. 6, 47.

Two translations published in London so nearly together would seemingly indicate a marked popularity there for the French writer. James Howell's opinion, therefore, comes on the reader unexpectedly. In returning a copy of Balzac to the lender, Howell censured French letter writers for their affectations of style and emptiness of matter. "I cannot well away with such sleazy Stuff, with such Cobweb-compositions." He had found Balzac's letters to the king flat, and those to Richelieu filled with hyperboles and gross flattery, and was ready to return the borrowed book in disgust. But these unfavorable views were not published by Howell until it was too late to influence public opinion.

Voiture's letters, first published after his death in 1650, were translated into English by Dryden and some of his friends in 1696. Had Dryden and his associates done their work earlier, Voiture's letters would have had a more controlling influence on Englishmen. In easy, graceful style Voiture reveals the trivial matters of his life. He writes from Spain, "a Place where there are no Nightgowns, no Chimnies, nor any Fires, but upon a Victory, or the Birth of a Prince." He describes his campaigning "in Heathenish Places, where we may as well expect to meet all the Niceties of Paris, as Pens, Ink, and Paper." Another letter describes Granada and the country of Don Quixote; another is written from Barbary, where he is ready to maintain "that Africa never produced any Creature so beautiful and so cruel" as his fair correspondent. All through the letters this thread of graceful, and one fears insincere, compliment runs. To a man who has ruined him at cards, Voiture wrote: "Tho' you have won my Money, yet at the same time you have also won my Heart." Balzac had justified his hyperboles by a reminder of Christ's reference to the camel and the needle's eye. More than this would be necessary to justify Voiture's. With no apparent hesitation he wrote, "You have more Charms in the Corner of one Eye, than the whole Earth contains."[42]

[42] *The Works of Monsieur Voiture. In Two Volumes. . . . Translated by the most eminent Hands,* viz. Mr. Dryden, etc. London, 1736. See vol. 1, pp. 1, 124, 133, 137, 281; vol. 2, pp. 15, 27.

Always subject to this temptation, Voiture appears best in actual narrative or description, especially in compressing details in this fashion: "the High-ways from Paris hither, are all strewed with Violins and Haut boys, Musicians and Dancers, Masks and Patches, Ribbands and Top Knots, Cloth of Silver and Embroidery, which come thronging into the City."

Joseph Hall was certainly one of the first in England to use the letter for distinctly literary purposes. Many had written merely to convey news. Breton's *Mad Poste* antedated Hall's collection by several years; but it was obviously a letter book only. Hall wrote as a man of letters to a particular person but with a wider circle of readers in view. Hence there is truth in the claim he advanced in dedicating his *Epistles* to Prince Henry: "Your Grace shal herein perceiue a new fashion of discourse, by Epistles; new to our language, vsual to others: and (as Noueltie is neuer without some plea of vse) more free, more familiar. Thus, we do but talke with our friends by our pen, and expresse our selues no whit lesse easily; some-what more digestedly." The type of literature here described was more new in England than in other countries, and Hall, who had been one of the early writers of satire and of characters, stood again as a pioneer.[43]

But Hall seems to be a leader in this field only to the reader who takes English literature alone into consideration. Hall gave his advice on travel to the Earl of Essex. He explained to Sir Robert Drury and Lady Drury how higher clerical duties forced his departure. He discoursed on retirement, immoderate grief, clerical marriages, his own version of the Psalms, duelling, and true courtliness. At once, Seneca, Pliny, and others come to mind. These weighty matters, however, that Seneca had handled so naturally, are approached by Hall in an apologetic spirit. An epistle seemed to him hardly the fittest medium for treating them; and, whether rightly or wrongly, he, the later bitter opponent of Milton, could say: "I doe not willingly suffer my penne to wade into questions." Such scruples were

[43] *Epistles. Three Volumes.* London, 1608, 1608, 1611.

soon forgotten as he warmed to his work, and like "marginal Prynne" he could pack learned quotations about three sides of his text. Too many of his letters call for such display. But Hall wrote with an artist's care, and often, even in discussions of questions now of no concern, interesting thoughts stand forth. For example, taking toward doubt the attitude of the satirist, Donne, and later Tennyson, Hall wrote: "That man neuer beleeued, that neuer doubted. This liquor of faith is neuer pure in these vessels of clay, without these lees of distrust."[44] Where Breton's letters are racy in content and deft in style, Hall's are marked by a depth of thought and a staider literary grace.

Milton several years later ridiculed Hall for apparently writing in the belief that all sentences "above three inches long were confiscate."[45] But in speaking his thoughts with a simplicity and brevity unusual at the time, Hall was following the principles of the letter books and the practice of his forerunners. For example, he wrote in quite characteristic style "of the pleasure of studie and contemplation." He begins with these words: "I can wonder at nothing more, than how a man can be idle; but of all other, a Scholar; in so many improuements of reason, in such sweetnesse of Knowledge, in such varietie of studies, in such importunitie of thoughts. Other Artizans do but practise, we still learn; others run still in the same gyre, to wearinesse, to satietie, our choice is infinite." Equally interesting is the essay on the miseducation of England's gentry. In other countries, Hall noted characteristically, "the sons of Nobles scorne not, either Marchandise, or learned professions, and hate nothing so much, as to do nothing; I shame & hate to thinke, that our gallants hold there can be no disparagement, but in honest callings." In such writing, simple though it may seem, there is a real art.

Donne's letters, which followed Hall's in point of time, were not published until 1651, full twenty years after his death. As we have seen, he had very clear and sound ideas as to what

[44] *Decad.* 4, *Epist.* 6, p. 171.
[45] *Apology,* vol. 3, p. 99.

others had done in their letters. And his own notion of what the letter should be was sound; "when Letters have a convenient handsome body of news, they are Letters; but when they are spun out of nothing, they are nothing, or but apparitions, and ghosts." Donne saw, also, that the news should be conveyed with something of the informality of speech. To Henry Goodyer he wrote once: "This Letter shall but talke, not discourse; it shall but gossip, not consider, nor consult." A letter so written "contributes, though not to the being, yet to the verdure, and freshnesse" of a friendship. All this is the theory of the familiar letter.[46]

One wonders, then, why Donne's own letters are so destitute of real news, and what his correspondents derived from them to justify the pains the sender was put to. Too few of them come with so personal a touch as this: "I write from the fire side in my Parler, and in the noise of three gamesome children." Sometimes he put the only item of real news at the very end, after the subscription, as though news, even of a brother, had no place in correspondence lest compliments be crowded out. In the main, Donne indulged in a tissue of involved compliment and adulation. Like his poetry, the letters overflow with strange mystical conceits and dialectic. His comment in one epistle is: "It becomes my fortune to deale thus in single money; and I may hit better with this hail-shot of little Letters (because they may come thick) then with great bullets; and trouble my friends lesse." With such conceits as this goes a good deal of dialectic.[47] "It makes no difference that this came not the same day, nor bears the same date as his; for though in inheritances and worldly possessions we consider the dates of Evidences, yet in Letters, by which we deliver over our affections, and assurances of friendship, and the best faculties of our souls, times and daies cannot have interest, nor be considerable, because that which passes by them, is eternall, and

[46] *Letters To Severall Persons of Honour.* C. E. Merrill, ed. New York, 1910, pp. 104, 124, 98.

[47] *Ibid.*, pp. 118, 6, 226.

out of the measure of time." However unusual such display of "wit" may be in the letter, it is quite in accord with the poetry of this strange genius.

Donne's correspondence falls far short of meeting the requirements for a letter laid down by Abraham Cowley. "You will be angry," he wrote, "at a Letter that should leave you not at all wiser at the latter end of it, than you were at the Beginning."[48] His own, in this respect, were far different from Donne's. Written from Paris, about 1650, where the writer for almost a decade served as official secretary for the exiled Stuarts, they are filled with news of the royal exiles and rumors of trouble between England and Scotland. The sentences are clear, and the thoughts directly expressed. It was easier for the skilled essayist than for the eloquent preacher of St. Paul's to stoop to familiar correspondence. Cowley, moreover, in Paris was closer to the social cliques of the French wits.

By this time, taught by the ancient Romans, the Italian humanists, and the French of the Grand Siècle, the English writers had learned what the familiar letter should be. Their theory is well summed up in *The Courtiers Calling*.[49] An epistle is the most difficult form of composition, for it is "the true production of our minde. . . . the lively and natural Picture of our thoughts and imaginations." Letters may have method and style, but dispense with the more formal ornaments of oratory. "They begin without Exordiums, proceed without Narrations, explain without Artifice, prove without citing Authors, reason without Logick, delight and persuade without tropes and figures." This is all quite remote from the artificiality of the old formularies. To drive his point home the author flatly says that letters "cease to be good, when they appear learned and studyed," and that "there is not more miserable stuff than the Letters of those famous men of Colledges."

[48] *Miscellanea Aulica. . . . Containing letters . . . by the famous A. Cowley. . . . Collected . . . by Mr. T. Brown.* London, 1702. See Grosart's edition of Cowley's *Works*, vol. 2, p. 349.

[49] *The Courtiers Calling.* 1675, pp. 187-189. This book is a direct translation of Jacques de Callières, *Fortune des Gens de Qualité.* See below, p. 168.

In writing this passage the unknown translator of *The Courtiers Calling* may have had in mind the *Epistolae Ho-elianae* of James Howell, the open-hearted, chatty genius who took the old formulary and made of it stuff for literature. Surely, there is a direct relation between the earlier books and his. In the first place, Howell classified letters, just as Angel Day had done, as narratory, objurgatory, consolatory, and the like. All that he wrote, moreover, though he never confessed it, may easily be placed in one category or another. Then again, in another letter that jests at the slovenly penmanship of a friend, Howell directly borrowed from the popular *Golden Epistles* of Guevara.[50] A reader, therefore, naturally suspects that Howell borrowed directly from some other compiler of model correspondence when he playfully recommended his servant to a gentleman in need of a footman or a cook to a lady. Finally, Howell looked on the familiar letter just as teachers of correspondence had done. "That's a true familiar Letter," he believed, "which expresseth one's Mind." It should be, therefore, "short-coated, and closely couched," clad, as it were, "in hungerlin rather than gown." Such an epistle brings "one of the prime Comforts of a Traveller"; for it will "beget new Spirits in him, and present joyful Objects to his Fancy."[51]

Such an approach to the *Familiar Letters* seems to render their genuineness at once suspect. In fact, the authenticity of Howell's supposed correspondence was soon questioned. His work first appeared in 1645, and was enlarged twice, in 1647 and 1650. But in 1691 Anthony à Wood wrote: "Many of the said Letters were never written before the Author of them was in the Fleet, as he pretends they were, only feigned . . . and purposely published to gain money to relieve his necessities."[52] The doubts have never been quieted. Many casual readers have wondered how the luckless Welshman could venture to write

[50] *Epistolae Ho-elianae*, I. 1, no. 1; I. 5, no. 28. *Golden Epistles*. London, 1577, Letters 12 and 7.

[51] *Ibid.*, I. 1, nos. 1, 5.

[52] *Athenae Oxon.*, London, 1817. 3, p. 744.

to Sir Kenelm Digby, King Charles himself, and even to robust, combative Ben Jonson as outspokenly as he did. Editors on their part have noticed that the dates affixed to the letters and the events narrated in them do not coincide. Howell even prophetically announced the death of someone before it actually occurred. Worse still, he mingled often in a single letter events that happened years apart. Hence some readers insist that Howell's work is purely fictitious, undertaken as a means of support while the inventive author was imprisoned in the Fleet.

Admirers of Howell, however, have been quick to answer these charges. A portion of the correspondence, at least, seems genuine. We know, also, that the letters were not dated in the first edition, and may assume that the author hurriedly dated them, on republication, without more than a glance at the contents. And if Howell's papers were seized by the Puritan officers, as he declared they were, the copies that remained may have been so fragmentary as to render possible even the error of including in a single letter events that were not synchronous. But possibly the truest defence would be that the whole dispute is over a matter of very little consequence. That dates and events do not exactly jibe will cause the average reader no discomfort, and, if Howell's correspondents never saw his racy epistles, they and not we are the losers. Had Bunyan busied himself altogether in prison with tagging shoe strings, the world would have been the poorer. So too James Howell might have satisfied his personal needs less generously than in feigning this correspondence for posterity. Such fiction exceeded even Montaigne's skill. It was high time for the old formulary to be infused with the breath of genius.

The process of transforming the stilted letter book was begun by the inclusion of Howell's own self in his correspondence. On his first leaving England he took dutiful leave of his father, but not so stiltedly as obedient children in the formularies had done. Howell thanked his father for his "most indulgent and costly Care" of him and for the liberal education under the "learned (tho' lashing) Master," which he could carry abroad,

not feeling "any Burden or Incumbrance unto me at all." He took leave also of his old tutor at Oxford, that course being "very handsome and an Act well becoming me." Other friends, as well, were remembered; for the whole world seemed to Howell agog with excitement over his departure. So it is through all the letters. He could tell but little of his business for the glass house in London, for never was a traveling man before or since so little encumbered by what is now called his "line." But Howell describes all that he saw in a vivid, racy fashion. He tells of his discouraging return to London, his second trip to Europe as a tutor, his adventure in Spain in behalf of the owners of the looted vessel, the *Vineyard,* his appeals to Buckingham for employment, his life as secretary on a country estate, his arrest and imprisonment. An active, alert, and friendly disposition gives color to all he wrote.

The letters are further quickened by the real events that they speak of. Raleigh returns a broken man, after the disastrous voyage of the *Destiny,* and is executed. The English adventurers are led through all the intricacies of the Spanish Match. Queen Henrietta comes to London; the ship money is levied and protested; Lord Bacon is condemned. No other follower of Angel Day had come so close to true history as this.

Hundreds of little happenings, too, that never could belong to history at all give just the personal, intimate touch that the letters need. How Captain Bolea "tho' a young man of about thirty, had his hair all turn'd grey, to the Admiration of all the World";[53] the conversion by anecdote of the young man who was "wont to rap out" those "deep, far-fetch'd Oaths";[54] Jack Toldervy's fondness for the Fleece in Cornhill; Lord Leicester's drinking of thirty-five healths without any serious impairment of his powers of locomotion—there are innumerable incidents of the sort lending spice and zest to the letters.

The *Epistolae Ho-elianae,* therefore, are a veritable welter of information. They contain news of the day, seemingly

[53] I. 4, no. 28.
[54] I. 5, no. 11.

authentic, historical essays, jokes and anecdotes for mixed and unmixed company, serious moralizings, lectures on language, religion, philosophy, and science. The information Howell offered was shamelessly plagiarized, for other men's learning was as little an encumbrance to him as his own; the letters may never have been sent, but all bear the mark of reality. As a man of letters he spoke his admiration of Carew, Henry King, and Jonson. He tells of the first reception of the *Religio Medici*. He calls Milton, Dr. Featly's opponent, a "triobolary Pasquiller" and a "sterquilinous Rascal." One can fancy a correspondent's disappointment who opened one of Howell's letters only to find a long and self-satisfied account of his devotions. Far better to find him starting, "touching this I remember a pleasant tale," although *carte blanche* to Howell on such a matter might cause serious embarrassment to the prudish.

There surely was no need of putting Howell's portrait as a frontispiece to his book. He is known through his work, the genial, open-hearted fellow that he was. In many ways he seems more like an eighteenth-century wit than any type of his own day. He may be childishly vain when he finds in Brittany plain signs of the Welsh race and learns that a king once ruled there named "Hoell the Great."[55] He was sometimes discouraged in his imprisonment. But he never begrudged another's release, and never lost his interest in life. No one else in a preface could have argued so entertainingly for spelling reform. Of all the grumblers over the weather, he alone thought of a "spissitude of air." Nor had any earlier traveler ever told men where a country might be found undisturbed by "the least Tintamar of Trouble." However unpromising their origin and however unauthentic their contents may be, the letters of Howell are the most interesting and genuinely personal letters of the century.

The success achieved by Howell and the popularity of French correspondence in England gave a new incentive and a somewhat new pattern to letter writers in London. Owen Feltham,

[55] I. 1, no. 20.

however, was hardly a disciple in the new school. In *A Taste of Some Letters* he really harked back to old-time letter books like Breton's; and, though he quoted a neat statement by Balzac, his own letters simply furnish models for those who would write on love or the affairs of life or books. Feltham showed here the same skill in epigram that gives savor to his *Resolves*. For example, writing to a wealthy young man whose bride was to bring but little dowry, Feltham observed: "When Adam had the world, God did not give him another with Eve." But in general the style of the letters is more involved and fantastic than that of the *Resolves*, and a comparison plainly reveals what these letter writers aimed to do.[56]

If Owen Feltham thus followed the old letter books too closely to give to his own efforts any of the intimate reality that graced Howell's, others in England copied the new pattern. The *Sociable Letters* of the Duchess of Newcastle are not to be taken as genuine letters. She herself confessed, "after some idle time I fell upon a vein of writing letters, and so fast did the vein run at first, as in one fortnight I writ above three score letters."[57] Had James Howell been equally frank, the literary world would have been spared a long debate. In this fictitious correspondence, the Duchess wrote in the new courtly style, as she termed it, and avoided old, hackneyed formalities, such as, "hoping you are in good health, as I am at the writing hereof." Yet she tried to write plainly and without display; for, in spite of new French graces, the letter remained what it always had been, an open way between the minds and hearts of distant friends.[58]

The Duchess of Newcastle showed in these letters something of James Howell's deftness in handling reality. No one would doubt the genuineness of the emotion caused by the tumults

[56] *Resolves. . . . With new and several other additions both in prose and verse.* London, 1661. These additional pieces appeared in this edition.

[57] *Plays,* Dedicatory Epistle. London, 1662.

[58] *CCXI Sociable Letters.* London, 1664. Fifty-one of the letters are printed in the *Life of the Duke of Newcastle,* Everyman Library. See pages 266, 217, 271.

in Antwerp. "Full of fear," and constantly interrupted by the terror of her servants, she described the outrages of the mob, the ringing of the bells, and the hurry of troops, ending with the consoling thought that, owing to the thoroughness of the Puritan sequestration, she and her husband, at least, were "plunder-free." Elsewhere she described vividly the winter sports of the Belgians, or sketched briefly the prevailing fashions. But in her exile she could not see good in those times when "debauchery is taken for wit, and faction for wisdom, treachery for policy, and drunken quarrels for valour." So turning her back rudely on the Lady Puritans and their like, she withdrew into her retirement. Her letters, therefore, lose in concrete detail. But if she lost by that the interest of men like Walpole, she in so doing became for Lamb "the thrice noble, chaste, and virtuous,—but again somewhat fantastical and original brained, generous Margaret Newcastle."[59]

The *Sociable Letters,* then, were chiefly the repository for the author's own quaint ideas and fancies. She spoke of her retirement, when she lived "free from the intanglements, confused clamours, and rumbling noise of the world." She thought of age, mindful that "wisdom's conversation is comfortable and pleasing" and determined rather to "live with wrinkles, than die with youth." Then, with a little of this wisdom, she insisted that "if the chief pillar of religion is faith, men should believe more, and dispute less," and that "one good deed is better than a thousand good words." Some of these observations are tinged with unconscious humor. Few will forget that "it requires experience, skill, and practice, for men, civilly, yet courtly, to entertain and accompany women in visiting." Nor is it futile to remember that, although the planets may not determine the course of our lives, still "men's minds . . . are moved and altered according to the motions and influences, and effects of each planet, or star."[60]

In presenting to the reader her odd fancies, the Duchess

[59] *Life of the Duke of Newcastle,* pp. 279, 296, 270, 221, 222.
[60] *Ibid.,* pp. 223, 231, 241, 243, 250, 273-274.

spoke of herself with attractive frankness. Naturally, she must be dependent; "for before the warrs of this country I was too young to be rich, or to have means in my own power of disposing, and since the warrs all my friends being so ruined, and my husband banished from his native country, and dispossest of his inherited estate, I have been in a condition rather to receive, than to give." To her husband, then, she gave her devotion, who seemed "to have the valour of Caesar, the fancy and wit of Ovid, and the tragical, especially comical art of Shakespear." Her own accomplishments were slight compared to these. Once, when she was roused from her studious life by the remarks of friends, she thought of spinning and embroidery and preserving as saving occupations for a lady; but from each she was dissuaded by her maid and finally concluded that she and her servants had better be idle "than to employ time unprofitably, and to spend mony idely." Her heart was in her writing. She speaks proudly of her plays; she alludes to her amazing romance of adventure in the northern seas, and finally confesses, "naturally I am so ambitious, as I am restless to live, as Nature doth, in all ages and in every brain."[61] In such revelations of self lies the main charm of the *Sociable Letters*.

The letters of the Duchess of Newcastle were equalled, if not surpassed, by the deftly written, vivacious correspondence of the "matchless Orinda." Katherine Fowler was born in Bucklersbury in 1631 of a middle-class, Presbyterian family. As a mere child she attracted much attention for her precocity, and as a schoolgirl began to write verses. When she was sixteen she married James Philips of Wales, and her new home at Cardigan Priory became the centre of the famous coterie of which the "matchless Orinda" was the ruling spirit. Each lady and gentleman associated in this Society of Friendship bore a poetic name. Mrs. Philips, of course, was Orinda, and her husband Antenor. We hear of Jeremy Taylor as the noble Palaemon, Sir Charles Cotterel, the celebrated court wit, as Poliarchus, Anne Owen as Lucasia, and Mary Aubrey as Rosania.

[61] *Life of the Duke of Newcastle,* pp. 244, 278, 283, 255.

Of these friendships and of her life in Wales and England her letters are full. And in addition there is the correspondence between her and Sir Charles Cotterel, "Poliarchus," her friend and editor, which was first published in 1705, some few years after her death.[62]

The first letter was written in December, 1661, while she was in London with her husband. Poliarchus had called on her and had confided to her his unrequited love for Calanthe. So, much flattered to have been made his confidante, she wrote to counsel him, and he, in turn, intrusted further confidences to her. Part of these were disclosed to Calanthe, just as the best of her letters were shown to the heart-struck wit. But such perfidy was not left unpunished; for Poliarchus, to prevent such betrayal in the future, wrote his most secret thoughts in Italian, and Orinda had another language to learn. Furthermore, Orinda had been so engrossed in this futile, distant courtship that she failed to notice most successful love-making under her very eyes. Her dearest friend, Lucasia, forgetting all this Platonic friendship, was betrothed to a gentleman bearing the sturdy English name, Hamner, and before Orinda realized it, "the Ceremony was perform'd to the great satisfaction of them all." Only Orinda mourned, and to Rosania and Poliarchus she communicated all the sad details. "I can say no more," she assured him, "my Time is so little and my Grief so great." Despite all that, she accompanied her friend, the bride, to her new home in Ireland, writing in self-satisfied fashion of the pleasure of a duty loyally performed, but concerned a trifle, it may be, "to see the Places and Persons where and with whom she is now to live and converse." It may have been fancy only that Lucasia's husband "behaves himself more despotically towards her than becomes him."[63]

In Ireland, though, other less feminine interests soon busied the gifted Orinda. While her husband was engaged in his lawsuits, she turned to literature. Soon her letters to Poli-

[62] *Letters from Orinda to Poliarchus.* Second edition, London, 1729.
[63] *Ibid.,* Letters 10, 11.

archus are filled with news of her translation of Corneille's *Pompey*. She sent parts for correction; she asked his advice. Then the play was brought out in Dublin and published there and in London. But the wits of the metropolis had also translated it. Orinda, though, modestly preferred her own, since "a Translation ought not to be used as Musicians do a Ground, with all the Liberty of Descant, but as Painters when they copy." Her own versification seemed better, too, for "the Sense ought always to be confin'd to the Couplet, otherwise the Lines must needs be spiritless and dull."[64] By this translation Orinda won the friendship of the Earls of Orrery and Roscommon, and became so much a literary celebrity that a badly mangled volume of verses was surreptitiously published in London. Poliarchus advised her to issue a correct edition; but she, professing to fear publicity, and regretting that she had not checked her "incorrigible inclination to that folly of riming," would consent to such measures of defence only "with the same Reluctancy that I would cut off a Limb to save my Life."[65]

Orinda's letters are written with grace and animation. Sir Charles Cotterel believed that they taught "how an Intercourse of Writing, between Persons of different Sexes, ought to be managed with Delight and Innocence." With so much more of "Sense, Energy, and Life" in these letters, he thought that it would be foolish for English readers any longer to depend on translations from the French.[66] The fact is, Mrs. Philips really caught a good deal of the grace of Balzac and Voiture. She was as importunate as she was graceful. If she allowed a fortnight to pass without writing, she called the interim "a longer Vacation than I have suffer'd you to enjoy since I saw you, or than you are ever like to have again, if I have my Health and Wits about me." Yet in spite of her constant depreciation of her own letters, as contrasted with his, and her gracious compliments, she leaves the impression of sincerity. Like all other born letter

[64] *Letters from Orinda to Poliarchus,* Letters 19, 37.
[65] *Ibid.,* Letter 46.
[66] *Ibid.,* Preface.

writers she knew just how to lend interest to her news. "All this," she cautioned Poliarchus, "is under the Rose, and I would have kept it to my self, did I not repose an entire Confidence in you." He could hardly fail to be impressed by her little confidences regarding the dullness of her husband's society or her schemes for effecting a meeting with him in London. No letters more familiar or with a more literary flavor were written in England during the seventeenth century.[67]

By this time editors and publishers had learned to appeal to the taste of the time, and numerous collections of letters, more or less extensive, appeared. The letters of Abraham Cowley, for example, written during his secretaryship in Paris, brought to English readers an account of the royal household in exile there and an idea of the news from Scotland and England that reached the Continent.[68] So also a few letters were published in the collected works of Francis Osborne.[69] The versatile journalist, Tom Brown, "of facetious memory," as Addison said, was especially active in compiling such volumes of letters, and he wrote some himself which were called "merry letters."[70] Loveday's letters, published by his brother, are dull and colorless enough; he was one of the last to address his stilted compliments and felicitations to his nearest relatives in the old way. In that respect the letters of the Earl of Rochester and Sir John Suckling are of more value.[71] Suckling could take the time-honored consolatory type and make something of it. Writing, supposedly, to a woman who had lost her husband, he remarked: "I thank Heaven we live in an Age in which the Widows wear Colours, and in a Country where the Women

[67] *Letters from Orinda to Poliarchus,* Letters 18, 11. A few more of her letters were published by the Earl of Rochester in *Familiar Letters,* London, 1697, vol. 1, pp. 137-152.

[68] *Miscellanea Aulica.* London, 1702.

[69] *The Works of Francis Osborne.* 8th Edition. London, 1682.

[70] *A Collection of Miscellany poems, letters, &c.* London, 1699.

[71] *Familiar Letters, by the Right Honourable John, Late Earl of Rochester, . . . with Letters by Several Eminent Hands.* 2 vols. London, 1705. Contains letters by Otway, Katherine Philips, Tom Brown, and others. *Letters to Several Persons of Honour.* By Sir John Suckling. London, 1659.

that lose their Husbands may be trusted with Poison, Knives, and all the burning Coals in Europe, notwithstanding the precedents of Sophonisba and Portia." He then adds an appropriate story that he had read in Balzac's letters. Suckling, too, could write entertainingly of his actual experiences. One letter he sent from Germany during the Thirty Years' War. Another came from the campaign against the Scotch, when he found himself on "the scantlet of ground" that Hotspur, the "angry monsieur," was ready to quarrel over. In such letters the influence of the *Epistolae Ho-elianae* is plainly in evidence. But there is too little of real experience and too little genuine wit in these letters written under the inspiration of Howell and the French school.

Fortunately, a considerable number of letters were written just after the middle of the century by a clever young woman, who aped not at all the preciosity of the French. In 1652 a family of Osbornes was living at Chicksands Priory, in Bedfordshire. While the daughter and her brother were at one time lodged at an inn on the Isle of Wight, the youth passed a part of an idle day in cutting on the windowpane his opinion of the rulers of the Puritan party. At once the Osbornes and a young man, William Temple, were taken before the governor. Dorothy generously took all the blame for the escapade on her own shoulders and the offenders were released. So she and Temple became lovers, and after her return to the old nunnery which was her home, she carried on a correspondence with the young man, who was soon to be Swift's patron. The letters are clever and natural and on the whole more entertaining than any other early collection, Howell's excepted.

The Osbornes, however, were opposed to the advances of Temple, who still had his name and place to win in the world. They marshaled, one after the other, other suitors for Dorothy, but she held them off or rejected them outright. Even Henry Cromwell, the son of the Lord Protector, interested her only because he promised to send the large Irish greyhound that she wished. And another suitor, a widower with four grown

daughters, whom she slightingly called the Emperour or Sir Jus, furnished her with jests for the apprehensive Temple. She promised to use her influence in his behalf with any one of the daughters he preferred and promised to be a good mother-in-law for him. Her loyalty to Temple seemed sometimes to amuse the elders of the family. "Sometimes I tell them I will not marry, and then they laugh at me; sometimes I say, 'not yet' and they laugh more, and would make me believe I shall be old within this twelvemonth." The brother took her self-will more seriously. On one occasion, provoked by her obstinacy, he rehearsed "all the people that I had ever in my life refused . . . like Richard the III's ghosts." The dispute waxed so warm that they came "near an absolute falling out" and neither one spoke much to the other for some time.

The letters are not wholly given over to this matter. In one of them she reviews the dull routine of life at Chicksands in the most entertaining way; what with the rising and the dressing and the walking in the garden between meals and the watching the wenches with their cattle on the common, she could declare, "In earnest, 'tis a pleasant place." Occasionally, she went to London, where she visited the Spring Gardens, played cards, and attended masked balls. "We go abroad all day, and play all night, and say our prayers when we have time." Once she was entertained by some friends, whose house was "the most filled of any since the ark." To her own amazement she went to church there on a week day and made caustic remarks on the tithe-loving, king-hating clergyman to Temple. She called on the famous astrologer, William Lilly, also, and with her friends "abused him, and said things purposely to confound him." In her leisure moments, too, she read a good deal. If the book happened to be a new French romance, like *Cleopatra* or *The Grand Cyrus,* she passed her judgment on it before sending the "tomes," as she called them, in packages of twos and threes, to Temple. When she came into possession of one of the Duchess of Newcastle's works, her curiosity was especially aroused because of what she had heard of the author's

eccentricities, and a reading convinced her that there were "many soberer people in Bedlam" than her ladyship. All in all, her letters are vivacious, witty, and high-spirited, and show that she had even more than Fanny Burney the gift of enjoying life in all its varied phases.

The earlier letters that have here been reviewed lack the genuine reality that Dorothy Osborne's possess. Howell's may deceive the reader for the time and always interest him. In the rest there is either the artificiality of stilted phrase or of preciosity. Cleverly written as they are, hers of course lack the literary touch that Howell's have or Katherine Philips'. For the combination of the two we must wait for the letters of Cowper, Horace Walpole, and others of the next century.

BOOKS OF COURTESY

THE concept designated in English by the word gentleman originally embraced the prestige of noble birth and long-standing social eminence. But the almost invariable concomitant of such position in early society was the possession of a landed estate. That, in turn, brought certain public duties and responsibilities into consideration; it rendered imperative, also, for the safeguarding of social leisure, the acquisition of numerous graces and accomplishments. Consequently, the application of the term gentleman was widened to include not birth and rank alone, but manners, education, and culture. This more courtly ideal, it has been suggested, can be traced from Europe back to Constantinople and Babylon.[1] Be that as it may, as early almost as social distinctions appear in antiquity, the confusion resultant from this extension of the idea was felt. Here, on the one hand, might be a noble in exalted station quite devoid of manners and education; there, on the other hand, a low born fellow of unquestioned integrity and culture. What, then, is the gentleman?

Philosophers, more commonly than men of affairs, have ever been prone to disparage the external criteria of the gentleman. In the *Theœtetus,* Socrates is made to show with quiet irony how insignificant family position appears to a person who views more of life than a few short generations.[2] "The noble should rule over the ignoble," Plato declared in the *Laws,* as it was at Athens, where no one was barred from authority because of "weakness or poverty or obscurity of origin."[3] And both he and Plutarch agree that for a gentleman "nothing is more dishonourable than to be honoured, not for his own sake, but

[1] Von Ihering, *Evolution of the Aryan,* 1897, pp. 94-98.
[2] Trans. Jowett, 3d ed. 4, p. 233.
[3] *Laws,* 5, p. 71; *Menexenus,* 2, p. 522.

on account of the reputation of his ancestors."[4] Aristotle's stand was more ambiguous.[5] He recognized the fact that "good birth is always valued in a man's own home and country," and that men "are thought noble because they spring from wealthy and virtuous ancestors." But he, too, saw that "the noble are citizens in a truer sense than the ignoble" and that "political society exists for the sake of noble actions." In one place, seemingly, Aristotle recognized conditions as they are; in the other, conditions as they should be. Only the latter are noted by the early Jewish philosopher, Philo Judæus. He unequivocally declared: "we ought to call those men alone noble who are temperate and just, even though they may be of the class of domestic slaves," and "that nobility is placed only in the acquisition of virtue, and that you ought to imagine that he who has that is the only man really noble, and not the man who is born of noble and virtuous parents, is plain from many circumstances."[6] In short, Philo esteemed noble ancestry of no more advantage to a base man than good eyesight in the parents of a blind man is to him.

The whole question assumed a new and enhanced importance in Italy during the sixteenth century. Little courts flourished there as nowhere else, in the familiar intercourse of which gentlemen and ladies felt the need of higher standards of culture and refinement. Among the citizens, too, of the prosperous Italian towns, a demand for better social manners was made. The word courtesy has been commonly chosen to designate the ideal of character and conduct that took root in the courts, as civility is used to describe the new etiquette of urban society. And just as Xenophon in the *Cyropædia* drew up a plan for the education of a prince, and as Cicero and Quintilian defined the accomplishments and prescribed the training of an orator, because prince and orator to them denoted the highest calling, so the Italian humanists set forth their patterns for the true courtier and the refined citizen. The mere number of these

[4] *Menexenus*, 2, pp. 522, 530. Plutarch, *Of Education*, Bohn translation, pp. 7-8.
[5] *Politics*, 3. 9, 13; 5. 1.
[6] *A Treatise of Nobility*.

books of courtesy and etiquette shows convincingly the engrossing interest of humanism in the theme.

Nevertheless, the Italian humanists experienced no less difficulty than the ancient philosophers faced in determining the exact criterion of nobility. The divergence of their views is plainly stated by Dante in the *Convito*. Some, he explains, believe that nobility depends on ancient riches and gentle breeding; others consider inherited wealth alone sufficient; his own view is that nobility is the friend of wisdom and arises from man's spiritual condition.[7]

Dante's judgment, however, did not meet with universal acceptance. For example, Charron, admitting that many consider "virtue and quality, without any consideration of race or ancestors," enough to constitute nobility, and that men should not look to their pedigree for honor, still felt it strange that "one come from the house of a Butcher or Vintner should be held for noble."[8] Even more decisively, if one may judge from a single extract, Sir John Ferne spoke; "It appeareth that no man can be properly called a gentleman, except he be a gentleman of blood possessing virtue."[9] But even these writers, be it noted, do not assert that virtue can be dispensed with, even by a person nobly born. The common opinion was expressed by Peter de la Primaudaye; although nobility may spring from ancestry, knowledge, or gentle deeds, "there is no right Nobilitie, but that which springeth of virtue, and good conditions."[10]

By others Dante's view was often defended. Osorio, for example, argued that nobility has its origin in character, though, if it endure for several generations, the entire family acquires distinction. Nenna, also, believed that "a gentleman borne of noble blood ought to be entirely good and therewithall he ought

[7] *Il Convito,* Book 4, chaps. 3, 30.

[8] *Of Wisdome.* Translated by S. Lennard, 1658. Book 1, chap. 59.

[9] *Blazon of Gentrie.* 1586. Cited by K. D. Bulbring in Defoe's *Compleat Gentleman,* p. xlii.

[10] *The French Academie.* Translated by T. B. 2d edition, 1589, p. 694. So also Guillaume de la Perrière in *The Mirrour of Policie.* London, 1599. Unpaged. See p. 144.

in like manner to bee wise, prudent, just, and temperate, advised in all actions. . . . He ought to be couragious and gratious, but especially of a sharp wit, quicke judgment, and good understanding." Through translation the work of both these men was given to English readers in the sixteenth century.[11] And still more consciously Muzio Justinopolitano sought to reconcile the two conflicting ideals.[12] Men, he admitted, lay claim to nobility on various grounds—birth, wealth, dignities, great achievements, and virtue (vertù), and all are of some importance, since man's condition is determined by his state of mind, body, and fortune. But the supreme test of nobility is the mind; for, as other factors are easily wiped out and vary from place to place, true magnanimity everywhere and always confers nobility on its possessor.

One of the earliest books of courtesy in England was *The Institucion of a Gentleman,* first published in 1555 and reprinted in 1568. Its unknown author simply followed his Italian masters with scrupulous fidelity. Occasionally, he gave a touch of English life to his theory, in references to Chaucer, Oxford, and Cambridge, and the roistering, overdressed gallants of London.[13] But there is nothing new in his theory. "No man," he said, "can iustly inioy this name [of gentleman] which hath in him leude behauour or vnhonest condicions, . . . neither can hee deserue place or estimacion aboue others vnlesse by the worthynesse of hys condicions, hee deserue the same." And again, using the word virtue in the Italian sense, to denote "all goodnes, nothinge to excede nor nothing to be wanting," he remarked: "the giftes of Fortune enriche a Gentleman slenderly, but the giftes of virtue are thynges which bring euery man to honour." Three sorts of noble men are then distinguished. There is first the gentle gentle, "he which is born of noble kyndred descendyng of gentle blud"; then the gentle

[11] *De Nobilitate Civili,* Book 1, p. 15; *Nennio,* p. 184. Both citations are from A. Smyth-Palmer: *The Ideal of a Gentleman.* London, n. d. *Nennio* was translated by W. Jones in 1595.

[12] *Il Gentilhuomo.* Venice, 1569, pp. 11, 105, 112, 172, 184.

[13] I have used the unpaged reprint, London, 1839.

ungentle, whose high lineage is stained by his own "corrupt and vngentle maners;" and lastly the ungentle gentle, "borne of a lowe degree, of a poore stocke," who "by his virtue, wyt, pollicie, industry, knowledge in lawes, valiency in armes, or such lyke honeste meanes becometh a welbeloued & hygh estemed man."[14]

Describing the characteristics of the gentle gentle, especially, the author displays his idea of true nobility. Such a gentleman must join to his high lineage "gentle maners and noble condicions." Moreover, he "ought to be learned, to haue knowledge in tounges, and to be apte in the feates of armes." He should also "haue in hym courtlye behauoure," "knowe how to treate and interteyne men of all degrees," and possess as well "sume knowledge in musike." Finally, he "ought to be a man fyt for the warres, & fit for the peace."[15] Such a man, as a servant of the state, a soldier, an ambassador, or, if nothing more, a country justice, can render to others the service that nobility presupposes.

The great teacher, Richard Mulcaster, followed exactly the same train of thought. He named as the criteria of true gentility, "wisedome in pollicie, valiance in execution, iustice in deciding, modestie in demeanour," and asserted that, since nobility "argueth a courteous, ciuill, well disposed, sociable constitution of minde," it is "lymited not by wealth, but by worth, which accompany the party, and expire with his breath."[16]

But the age of the Levellers had not yet come in England, and even men who viewed nobility in this way spoke with utmost respect of the upper classes. They all agreed with Mulcaster: "He that continueth it in discent from his auncestrie by desert in his owne person, hath much to thank God for, and doth well deserue double honour among men." Conversely, the

[14] Stefano Guazzo, making this same classification, called it a "volgar distintione." *La Ciuil Conuersatione.* Venice, 1621, p. 125. (First edition, 1574.)

[15] *Cf.* Milton's famous definition, *Of Education.*

[16] *Positions,* pp. 199-200, 205. 1581. *Cf.* the *Ayenbite of Inwyt.* R. Morris, ed., p. 87. E. E. T. S. 1866.

newer gentry was commonly treated with some distrust. The author of *The Institucion of a Gentleman* complained that "the newe sorte of menne whyche are run out of theyr order, and from the sonnes of handycraft men, have obteigned the name of gentleman" owe their honor neither to learning nor merit. Sir Thomas Smith felt the same doubt. After quoting verbatim from Harrison's *Description of England* a long passage showing the ease with which men in England then rose to title, he expressed his disapprobation, mainly on the ground that a gentleman is expected to render exceptional service to the state, and "must shew also a more manly courage, and tokens of better education, higher stomacke, and bountifuller liberalitie then others."[17]

Possibly Richard Mulcaster was right in thinking that little good came of such fine discrimination. "One might talke beyond enough, and write beyond measure, that would examine what such a one saith of nobilitie in greeke, such a one in latin, such in other seuerall toungues." It is surely enough if gentlemen will "maintaine that glorie in their families with prayse, which learned men in so many languages, do charge them with in precept." As one turns back to those old treatises on nobility, one may well bear in mind Mulcaster's conclusion: "whether nobilitie come by discent or desert it maketh no matter, he that giueth the first fame to his familie, or he that deserueth such honour, or he that enlargeth his parentage by noble meanes, is the man whom I meane."[18]

Castiglione's *Cortegiano,* or *The Book of the Courtier* as it has been called in English, is one of the finest monuments of the Italian Renaissance.[19] Fresh and sincere, it still comes to the reader from those old days before scholarship and courtliness had become acquisitions, and while they still were a part of the man himself. How else could this very book have been written, by one who was primarily a knight in arms, a soldier

[17] *The Commonwealth of England,* 1640, chap. 20.
[18] *Positions,* pp. 195, 199.
[19] I use the translation of L. E. Opdycke, New York, 1901.

in the wars of his country, and a devoted servant of the church? Half the charm of the work for many readers comes of its intimate, unprofessional air. Castiglione professed to write—and one believes him—only to gratify a friend and "to revive a pleasant memory," and his book incites to refinement and culture simply because its author, in spite of his modest disclaimers, represented completely the ideal that he attempted to formulate.

In the most human way Castiglione approached his subject. He first drew a pleasant picture of Urbino, the little city "on the slopes of the Apennines towards the Adriatic sea," and of the stately palace, "the most beautiful to be found in all Italy," built by one of Urbino's courtly dukes on the rugged hillside and furnished with rich hangings, splendid statues and paintings, and "a goodly number of most excellent and rare books in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew," which the great duke esteemed "the chiefest excellence of his great palace." *The Book of the Courtier* was begun in that place, with the duke and his gracious lady to encourage the author. Then cares and even dangers crowded in to engross Castiglione's time, and the manuscript was laid aside and half forgotten. But about 1518 the author was able to complete it, and it was published in 1528. Almost wistfully Castiglione thought of the days in the palace at Urbino, and, as he remembered old friends there, he was "saddened not a little . . . by the thought that most of the personages introduced in the discussion were already dead." The *Courtier* purports to record a discussion on the nature and accomplishments of the perfect courtier that occupied the gentlemen and ladies at Urbino during four long evenings. Castiglione professed to have been absent on a mission to England at the time; but he had learned from friends of the conversation, and, like Plato in the *Phædo* and Cicero in the *De Oratore,* reproduced what he had been told. Yet to-day, we can see the little group of gentlemen and ladies sitting circlewise, listening intently to the words of each speaker, and ready at all times to laugh good-humoredly at each clever sally or to

interpose objections and queries. From beginning to end the story is carried through in this easy, natural manner.

Life in the palace of Urbino was marked for its perfect freedom and decorum. Duke Guido "took care to fill his household with very noble and valiant gentlemen, with whom he lived most familiarly, delighting in their intercourse." The days were given over "to honourable and pleasant exercises as well for the body as for the mind," and the evening pastimes, after the duke was forced by his infirmity to withdraw for the day, were graciously ruled by his duchess and her friend, Lady Emilia. During the twelve years that Castiglione served the dukes, the finest Italian culture was found at Urbino. It was the duchess herself, Elisabetta Gonzaga, who seated her admirers circlewise that evening, ladies and gentlemen alternating as far as there were ladies to serve; and it was Lady Emilia, who, after the topic of courtiership had been proposed, called on Count Ludovico to begin. The game, she explained, would be less tedious if the speaker could be counted on to mishandle the subject and stand in need of correction. To this the count neatly answered: "Whoever told the truth, my Lady, would run no risk of lacking contradiction, so long as you were present."[20] So with much laughter and light *badinage,* the delineation of the perfect courtier was begun.

Just this easy, but decorous, freedom gives character to Castiglione's whole book. Nothing is said of those social rules that made up the popular books of etiquette. Those books, in Italy at least, if not in southern France where they originated, were written for larger audiences in the cities, which were just beginning to concern themselves about manners; the *Courtier* was addressed to a refined audience that needed no book of etiquette. Furthermore, Castiglione made no attempt to frame a system of education. More than once his speakers insist that they are concerned only with the description of the courtier, and not at all with the process of training one. "Great folly would be mine," Giuliano de' Medici admits, "to pretend to

[20] *Il Cortegiano,* pp. 10, 20.

teach others that which I do not myself know." Castiglione's ideal, evidently, was a social life so correct in all particulars that rules are uncalled for. His courtier is to possess grace—that "universal seasoning, without which all other properties and good qualities are of little worth." Those who have it "have little need of other master";[21] they act without the compulsion of external rule or without affectation from inner whims and fancies. Refinement is more the spontaneous expression of right character than the observance of rule. Castiglione's care, therefore, is for the proper nurture of man, and his book has all the depth and scope of the Renaissance mind.

To attempt a matter-of-fact summary of such a work would indeed be foolhardy. It deals largely with the culture of the inner life, always an elusive thing, in the most undogmatic manner. In the dialogue, furthermore, there is much of the ordinary play and interplay of ideas. Yet the reader gathers, bit by bit, a clear picture of the courtier as the author imagines him.

Count Ludovico, who opened the discussion, would have the courtier of gentle race; "for noble birth is like a bright lamp that manifests and makes visible good and evil deeds, and kindles and stimulates to virtue both by fear of shame and by hope of praise." Such stimulus is lacking in men of meaner birth, who have no high traditions to support. The count, however, is ready to admit the truth of Lord Gaspar's objection that some low-born men achieve really high eminence. But the general opinion is that, "to form a Courtier without flaw and endowed with every praiseworthy quality, it seems . . . necessary to make him nobly born, as well for many other reasons as for universal opinion."[22] So in spite of the common teaching that nobility rests on character, Italy was willing to recognize the advantages of family connections.

More specifically, Count Ludovico then went on in this strain. "The principal and true profession of the Courtier ought

[21] *Il Cortegiano,* pp. 42, 33.
[22] *Ibid.,* pp. 22, 24.

to be that of arms." To this end he should be skillful with weapons of all kinds, and expert in horsemanship, and, by engaging in such games as leaping, running, and tennis, must acquire strength and suppleness of body. Other exercises, such as tumbling, or any public competition with inferiors, hardly befit a gentleman. The courtier's ideals are "perfect loyalty and unconquered courage." He should be versed in French and Spanish as well as Latin and Greek, and should be familiar with all the great poets, orators, and historians of antiquity. It were well, too, for the courtier to be not simply a graceful and effective talker, but a poet, a musician, and something of an artist. Music and drawing, however, are to be for him merely accomplishments, in which no exact skill is necessary. Far greater stress is laid on speaking and writing, the very foundation of all cultured intercourse. The very ease and skill of Castiglione's dialogue are an example of this skill in speech —il bel parlare—that Italian humanism so highly valued.

The book, which, for all its seeming simplicity and artlessness, is very dramatically arranged, reserves for the closing discussion Bembo's discourse on Platonic love, the highest instance of the courtier's perfection. Yet the real end of all the courtier's thought should be service.[23] "Indeed if by being nobly born, graceful, agreeable, and expert in so many exercises, the Courtier brought forth no other fruit than merely being what he is, I should not deem it right for a man to devote so much study and pains to acquiring this perfection of Courtiership." The nobleman's ambition should be "to lead his prince along the thorny path of virtue, decking it as with shady leafage and strewing it with lovely flowers to relieve the tedium of the weary journey; . . . and now with music, now with arms and horses, now with verses, now with love talk, and with all those means whereof these gentlemen have told, to keep his mind continually busied with worthy pleasures." This, certainly, was not regarded as the business of the knight

[23] *Il Cortegiano,* pp. 246, 251.

in the court of King Charles. The courtier was not then regarded as the guide and inspiration of his king. One of the last of the old race of knights was Sir Henry Wotton, plain Kentish gentleman and courtly servant. It proved a sorry day for Stuart kings when the courtier sank to the position of retainer and time-server.

The Book of the Courtier served Elizabethan Englishmen as a storehouse of anecdote. Here, for example, Shakespeare found the tale of the miserly hoarder of grain, who "hanged himself in despair from a rafter of his bedroom when he found that the price had greatly fallen."[24] The book expressed, as well, the highest degree of courtliness that the age could conceive—the ideal to which knights such as Sir Philip Sidney approximated. Interesting discussions, furthermore, slip in here and there, on choice diction, laughter and the comic spirit, friendship, and the like. The question of the development of the vernacular possessed an especial interest at the time when England was but just awakening to the latent powers of its native language.[25] In every way the book was fresh and vital to its generation.

Castiglione wrote chiefly for the refined gentlemen and ladies of the court, though his influence was not confined to that restricted field. Many others followed his example. Nifo wrote the *De Re Aulica* in 1534, Pino, *Del Galantuomo;* Timotei, another *Il Cortegiano* in 1614; and Muzio, *Il Gentilhuomo* in 1569.[26] Some of these works were translated at once into English, as was the *Discorsi* of Romei under the title, *The Courtiers Academie.* In all a compound of spiritual force (vertù), learning, accomplishments, and manners is insisted on. But as the demand for greater refinement made itself felt also in the citizen class, another type of book appeared, expounding the ideal of civility as *Il Cortegiano* had depicted the type of

[24] *Il Cortegiano,* p. 144.

[25] *Ibid.,* pp. 3-5, 39-45, 107, 123 *et seq.*

[26] A more complete list, containing works I have not seen, is given by T. F. Crane in *Italian Social Customs,* New Haven, 1920, pp. 206 *et passim.* On French imitations of the *Cortegiano* see P. Toldo, *Le courtisan dans la littérature française. Herrig's Archiv,* 114, pp. 75-121, 313-330; 115, pp. 60-85. 1900.

courtesy. These books are called books of etiquette, since they deal less with the true character of men and stress matters of conduct. Possibly they exerted a wider, if not a deeper, influence than the true books of courtesy.

The earliest treatises on etiquette were written in Provence. One by Arnaut de Marueil on table manners appeared as early as 1200. Amanieu de Sescas wrote two others, one on the conduct of youth, the other on the demeanor of the lady. Then Sordello, known to readers of Dante and Browning, still in the thirteenth century composed the *Documentum Honoris*. In northern France Robert of Blois, author of *Le Chastiement des Dames,* was not the only poet who discussed the question. The same type of book soon appeared in Italy and then of course in England, where its popularity was just as great.

One of the earliest of these Italian treatises is Fra Bonvesin's *De Quinquagenta Curialitatibus ad Mensam*. The author was a professor of rhetoric at Milan in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, and his advice on the *Fifty Courtesies of the Table* gives interesting glimpses of early social usage.[27] Two other early treatises were written by Dante's reputed teacher, Brunetto Latini. His encyclopedic *Tesoro,* in French prose, contains amid a mass of information on all manner of subjects a few rules of conduct. There are more in the shorter poetical work, the *Tesoretto*.[28] But neither author handled the subject as broadly as Francesco da Barberino in the *Documenti d'Amore* and *Del Reggimento e dei Costumi delle Donne*. His remarks on the seven faults of conversation and his advice on the all-important matter of giving presents still have value.

Here again a detailed examination of only a single exemplar of the type will suffice. Unquestionably, the best known of all the books on etiquette was Giovanni della Casa's *Galateo*. The learned author, who died toward the middle of the sixteenth

[27] *Italian Courtesy-Books,* W. M. Rossetti, ed. E. E. T. S., e. s., no. 8, 1869. This and the others are outlined by T. F. Crane, *Italian Social Customs,* pp. 322 *et seq.*

[28] Reprinted by Rossetti.

century as Bishop of Benevento, was a churchman, scholar, courtier, and poet. His book was named the *Galateo* because the advice it offers was supposedly given by an old man, Galeazzo, to a young nobleman, whose manners, especially at table, had proved offensive to his host. Immediately, the book won popularity in Italy, and was translated into English in 1576 by Robert Peterson, and several times reproduced there during the next century with the necessary alterations.

Della Casa presented an interesting apology for his effort. He appreciated the difference between the true books of courtesy and his own. "Albeit Liberalitie, or magnanimitie, of themselves beare a greater prayse, then, to be a well taught or manored man: yet perchaunce, the courteous behaviour and entertaynement with good maners and words, helpe no lesse, him that hath them: then the high minde and courage, advaunceth him in whome they be." But although he realized the pre-eminence of inner virtue, he nevertheless felt that mere manners are the first essential. "For these," he said, "be such things as a man shall neede alwayes at all hands to use. . . . But justice, fortitude, and the other greater, and more noble virtues, are seldome put in uze." Hence many men, destitute of "those other noble and better vertues," have lived in high esteem "for their cherefull & plesaunt behaviour alone." How much like Lord Chesterfield this sounds! Then Della Casa summed up his whole case thus: "to frame and order thy maners and doings, not according to thyne owne minde and fashion: but to please those, with whome thou lyvest."[29] The basis of all etiquette lies in this desire to please.

This gives the key to all Della Casa's judgment on breeding and politeness. One must avoid any conduct that may offend—loud coughing or sneezing, yawning, paring the nails or humming in public, reading a letter or falling asleep in company, or turning one's back on the speaker. Most of these rules on table manners now sound crude enough, not that they are anything but proper themselves, but because of the background

[29] From Peterson's translation, 1576, pp. 2, 4, 16.

of impropriety that they presuppose. On other matters, however, the advice remains more useful. In writing or conversation "our wordes must be so plaine, that all the companie may easily understand them," even though "Dant the learned Poet, did litle set by suche kinde of rules." Della Casa counseled the use of words "that be naturally bred in our soyle; and with all not so olde wt Age, that they are become rotten and withered: and as overworne apparell, leaft of and cast a side." He talked also on the graces of conversation, as Lord Chesterfield did. "The voyce would be neither hoarse nor shrill," nor should a gentleman "crye out and criche like the Pullye of a well," for "it is an yll noyse to heare a man rayse his voice highe, like to a common Cryer."[30] One must avoid, also, words of unpleasant meaning. Such advice, though it may be more pertinent now than other parts of the work are, still teaches the same lesson—to live without offense to others.

The Englishman who republished the *Galateo* in 1663 as *The Refin'd Courtier,* dedicating his translation to the Duke of Monmouth, observed: "Other Countries abound with treatises of good manners; and ours, perhaps, has as much need as any." Yet England had by no means been without them. Caxton's *Book of Curtesye,* as it is called, is a fourteenth-century poem dealing with the dress, behavior, and speech of youth. The advice, like Della Casa's, rests on this principle, "that ye offend not the company . . . remembryng wel that manners make man." Another early English work confines itself largely to table manners, and of course *The Babees Book* is generally known. In them all we find an interesting revelation of the social life of our ancestors.[31] Many of the Colloquies of Erasmus like *The Child's Piety* offer material of the same kind. Of their popularity one significant bit of evidence may be

[30] *Galateo,* pp. 75-77, 86.

[31] *Caxton's Book of Curtesye* is published in the E. E. T. S., e. s., London, 1869. Another *Boke of Curtasye* is to be found in the E. E. T. S., 1868, and in the Percy Society, vol. 4, London, 1841. In the volume of the E. E. T. S. is found also *The Babees Book* and others. W. M. Rossetti published an essay, *Italian Courtesy Books,* with texts, E. E. T. S., e. s., 1869.

added. Gabriel Harvey notes in one of his letters that Duns Scotus and Thomas Aquinas have been virtually banished from Cambridge, and that Castiglione, Della Casa, and Guazzo rule in their stead.[32]

In England, the first of these books of courtesy, Sir Thomas Elyot's *The Boke named the Gouernour,* happens to be also the finest. Published in 1531, some time after *Il Cortegiano,* it reproduces Castiglione's ideal, modified somewhat by later time and another environment. But Sir Thomas Elyot held the same chief end in view. "I thinke verily if children were broughte uppe as I haue written, and continually were retayned in the right studie of very philosophy untyll they passed the age of XXI yeres, . . . undoughtedly they shuld become men of so excellent wisedome that throughout all the worlde shulde be founden in no commune weale more noble counsaylours."[33]

But where Castiglione was concerned only with the description of the perfect courtier, Sir Thomas Elyot, like Plato and Plutarch and the humanists of Italy, described in detail the process of education by which the above end is achieved. The first seven years of the boy's life are to be passed under the care of a nurse, who is "to instill in them swete maners and vertuouse custome." Then some "auncient and worshipful man," as tutor, is to introduce the boy to Latin and such English as is "cleane, polite, perfectly and articulately pronounced." As soon as possible, grammar is to yield place to "the most swete and pleasant redinge of olde autours." Æsop and Lucian are good for beginners, and then Aristophanes, Homer, "from whom as from a fountaine proceded all eloquence and lernyng," Virgil, and other poets. In his fourteenth year, when "childhode declineth, and reason waxeth rype," the boy turns from poetry to logic, rhetoric, and oratory. History, too, and cosmography are "both pleasant and necessary." Finally, at the age of seventeen, the young student is to be introduced to philosophy in the *Ethics* of Aristotle, the *De Officiis* of Cicero,

[32] *Letter Book.* E. J. L. Scott, ed. Camden Society, London, 1884, pp. 78-79.
[33] *Boke named the Gouernour,* Book 1, chap. 14.

and the dialogues of Plato. "Lorde God," Elyot exclaimed, "what incomparable swetnesse of wordes and mater shall he finde in the saide warkes of Plato and Cicero,"—"those thre bokes be almoste sufficient to make a perfecte and excellent gouernour."[34]

But education was not summed up for Sir Thomas Elyot in book-learning alone. Music is a fine recreation for boys, provided they do not "in playinge and singynge only . . . put their holle studie and felicitie." Painting and sculpture, also, are useful, if they too are kept only "a secrete pastime, or recreation of the wittes." For physical exercise such diversions as wrestling, running, swimming, shooting with the long bow, and dancing prove beneficial. On dancing Elyot wrote an historical essay, which embodies both the old Greek respect for the moral value of rhythmic motion and the Italian idea that in the dancing of men and women the union of the spiritual qualities of the two sexes is symbolized.[35]

This whole system was largely ordered after the *De Liberis Instituendis* of Erasmus, the treatises of Aeneas Sylvius and Matteo Palmieri, and the older works of Plato, Aristotle, Plutarch, and Quintilian. But in the second book of the *Gouernour* Sir Thomas Elyot looked beyond the system of education to consider the spiritual qualities that should animate his gentleman. Here he took the broad outlook characteristic of the Renaissance and showed himself a true disciple of Palmieri and Castiglione.

Sir Thomas Elyot, like many others who had written on the subject, could not regard birth as the essential quality of nobility. Men were first called gentlemen "more for the remembraunce of their virtues and benefite, than for discrepance of astates." And nobility, he continued, is most conspicuous "where vertue ioyned with great possessions or dignitie hath longe continued in the bloode or house."[36]

[34] *Boke named the Gouernour,* Book 1, chaps. 4-5, 10, 11.
[35] *Ibid.,* Book 1, chaps. 7-8.
[36] *Ibid.,* Book 2, chap. 4.

Hence the nobleman or governor must possess real inward virtues. He should have first majesty, which is "proprelie a beautie or comelynesse in his countenance, langage, and gesture apt to his dignite, and accommodate to time, place, and company." His dress, too, should be fit, since there is "apparaile comely to euery astate and degree."[37] With these traits belong also affability, placability, mercy, benevolence, and a high sense of justice. Such was the perfect courtier according to the ideal of the Renaissance. Quite in the spirit of this concept Sir Thomas Elyot quoted Seneca, that the liberal arts do not give virtue, but "prepare the mynde to receive virtue."[38]

The Boke named the Gouernour certainly lacks the ease and spontaneity, even gayety, of Castiglione's *Courtier*. The analytic method of Aristotle has crowded these traits from the English book. Each chapter contains the exposition of one matter, and the last two, especially, in which the qualities requisite for leadership are specified, resemble the *Nicomachean Ethics*. But although the book may not progress so smoothly as Castiglione's, it is saved from dullness and frigidity by its author's fineness of temper. The picture of the king-bee on a sunny morning to illustrate the theory that a single governor best serves the needs of the state; the sympathetic interest in childhood; and the quaint and homely analogies—"lyke as in rennynge passynge the gole is accounted but rashnesse, so rennynge halfe waye is reproved for slownesse"—all these give a human touch to Elyot's work.

As a rule English treatises on courtliness were far less comprehensive than their patterns. The new ideas and the positive dangers to the state that the Reformation had brought, so engrossed attention that the old Italian ideal of courtliness seemed forced to yield to the conception of education as an uplifting or utilitarian force. On such a basis Sir Humphrey Gilbert drew up his proposals for an academy in England.[39]

[37] *Boke named the Gouernour,* Book 2, chaps. 2, 3.
[38] *Ibid.,* Book 3, chap. 24.
[39] *Queen Elizabethe's Achademy.* E. E. T. S., 1869. See pp. 1, 11.

He hoped that boys would no longer be "for the moste parte brought up, to no small grief of their frendes, in Idlenes and lascivious pastimes, estranged from all serviceable vertues to their prince and Cowntrey." Their training ought to be in "matters of accion meet for present practize, both of peace and warre," instead of in "schole learninges" only. Sir Humphrey Gilbert's whole aim was moral and practical; when an Englishman is seen, the beholders should know at once "that he is eyther a sowldiour, a philosopher, or a gallant courtier."

Lord Burghley had much the same ideal in mind in drawing up the *Ten Precepts* for his son.[40] Most of them concern the ordinary affairs of life, and there is little consideration of the courtly ideal. Without piety, "all other things are vaine & miserable." And although he would have his son mindful of "learning and obedience," he enjoins, "suffer not thy sonnes to pass the Alpes," and asserts that a professional soldier "can hardly be an honest man or a good Christian."

The exclusive interest of some English writers in the needs of the state was probably fostered by certain French treatises that attained great popularity. There was the work of Peter de la Primaudaye, first translated in 1586 as *The French Academie,* and republished in a fourth edition in 1602.[41] The tutor of the four young gentlemen who take part in this dialogue "indifferently taught his schollers the Latine toong, and some smackering of the Greeke"; for their parents desired "to see their children, not great Orators, suttle Logitians, learned Lawyers, or curious Mathematicians, but onely sufficiently taught in the doctrine of good living." This surely falls short of Castiglione's pattern. Another similar book was by Hurault, translated in 1595 by Arthur Golding as *Politicke, Moral, and Martial Discourses.* But still more concerned with matters of state is *The Mirrour of Policie* by Guillaume de la Perrière.[42] It discusses the three types of government and gives the prefer-

[40] In F. Peck, *Desiderata Curiosa.* London, 1779, pp. 47-49.
[41] Second edition, 1589. Citation from p. 3.
[42] English translation, London, 1598.

ence to monarchy. In the second part, domestic policy or government is treated. But in the third part the author comes back to his main interest and discusses the six essential callings of the population,—priesthood, magistracy, military command, merchant life, craftsmanship, and husbandry. Of especial interest are the charts that serve as an outline for the various topics broached. The diagram of true husbandry is interesting for its very simplicity. But the whole book shows the sort of influence that came from France.

The unfavorable side of the courtier's life and character was in fact often revealed in England, by Spenser, for example, and Skelton. Thomas North, also, translated Guevara's *Dial of Princes*. In the fourth book, "stiled by the Name of the Favoured Courtier," he points out all the discomforts, uncertainties, and humiliations that the courtier suffers. "If I fetched as many sighes for my sinnes, as Courtyers doe for their mishaps and disgraces: what a number would they come to?" Guevara exclaims. The pictures of the courtier's lodgings and his shifts to live and his greediness at meals are interesting, though the book on the whole is colorless. Guevara displayed the same aversion to court in his *Golden Epistles* and both books were very popular in England.[43] Spenser in *Mother Hubberds Tale,* like Guevara, calls him foolish who leaves his home to follow the uncertain and deluding opportunities of the court.

The same contraction of the old ideal of the courtier is found in Lyly's *Euphues*. Nor is this surprising; for, as Professor Feuillerat has shown, the author lived, when he first came to London, within the influence of Lord Burghley's austere household. There, naturally, the gifted young courtier would at least simulate an earnest attitude toward life.

Euphues is a young Athenian gentleman of great wealth, marked personal graces, and keen mind—the heir of both Nature and Fortune. Soon his unbridled life in Naples draws from an old gentleman the rebuke that turns the romance un-

[43] *The Diall of Princes,* 4th edition, 1619. *The Golden Epistles,* translated by Geffrey Fenton, London, 1577, pp. 13, 14, 118.

expectedly into an admonition. Here the opposite of wisdom seems to be wantonness, and the old sage's highest concern, "Serve God, love God, fear God, and God will so bless thee as either thy heart can wish or thy friends desire."[44] The young gentleman, for the time, rejects the well-meant advice.

But experience in love teaches Euphues certain lessons, which call from him the "Cooling Card" for his friend in love. He urges his friend to a worthier purpose than his loitering in love, and advises him to occupy his mind with law or medicine or the care of an estate or some honest, manly pastime. Professor Feuillerat has traced this section of *Euphues* back to Ovid's *Remedia Amoris*. Its general hostility to courtly love-making suggests to Bond such pictures of court life as are found in Guevara's *Menosprecio de la Corte*. It reminds us, too, of such English satire as is to be found in Spenser's *Mother Hubberds Tale;* but it leaves little impression of sincerity.

At last, as his thoughts grow still more serious, Euphues attempts to frame a plan for the complete education of youth. His plan is simply a close following of Plutarch's essay on education, with additions from the *Colloquium Puerpera* of Erasmus. Euphues aims "to set down a young man so absolute as that nothing may be added to his further perfection." But his chief concern is to curb the vicious inclinations of youth—"that all young gentlemen might shun my former looseness." So he drew that famous picture of student life at Oxford, the English Athens, beginning "Such playing at dice, and quaffing of drink, such dalliance with women."[45] At the time, Lord Burghley was busy with his reforms of university life, and it is not strange that Lyly should have ventured to write thus boldly. He sees the wide scope of education. Men lead what he calls a "trifold kind of life"—the active life as governors and magistrates; the speculative, as students; and a third, "most commonly a lewd life, an idle and vain life." Now Castiglione would have agreed with Euphues that neither the active life nor the studious

[44] *Euphues*. M. W. Croll, ed. London, 1916, p. 17.
[45] *Ibid.*, pp. 111, 113, 128.

life avails much without the other; but to exclude all else than these two as idle and profitless, marks the spirit of English reform. In intellectual, as in manual pursuits, "that deserveth greatest praise which bringeth greatest profit." "Vain is philosophy, vain is physic, vain is law, vain is all learning without the taste of divine knowledge."[46]

In a poet's way Edmund Spenser appreciated more fully than Lyly the Italian ideal of the courtier. Combining in his marvelously complex nature the deepest love of the world's beauty and a keen interest in art and letters and a vivid sense of moral duty, he represented in all its aspects the wide humanism of Italy. In the *Faerie Queene* he purposed "to fashion a gentleman or noble person in vertuous or gentle discipline." But his ideal of human perfection was so complex that perforce he had to dissect it. He chose King Arthur before his coronation to embody the twelve private virtues, and he planned another poem in which Arthur as king was to represent the public or politic virtues. Each virtue, moreover, was to be duly exemplified by a particular knight—holiness in the Red Cross Knight, temperance in Sir Guyon, and so on. But Spenser wished us to merge all these in our thoughts and so conceive the Glory of the Queen and the Magnificence of Arthur, a virtue which is "the perfection of all the rest."

This plan rests fundamentally on the *Nicomachean Ethics* of Aristotle. In the first book of the poem Spenser displayed man in his relations to God; in the second book, man in his relation to self; and in succeeding books, dealing with virtues like chastity, friendship, love, and courtesy, man in his relation to his fellow beings. But Arthur as the perfect knight was to embody the whole ideal of the Renaissance. Had Spenser presented this character according to his plan, Arthur would have been what the Courtier was to Castiglione or the Governor to Sir Thomas Elyot—a knight graceful yet strong in bearing, robust in body, courageous in heart, and trained in letters and art.

[46] *Euphues*, p. 146.

> Of Court, it seemes, men Courtesie doe call,
> For that it there most useth to abound;
> And well beseemeth that in Princes hall
> That vertue should be plentifully found,
> Which of all goodly manners is the ground,
> And roote of civill conversation.[47]

But this noble ideal, drawn from Aristotle and the Italian humanists, was never fairly incorporated in an English treatise.

Spenser had in mind not only perfect knighthood but perfect queenliness as well. For this, too, there was ample precedent in Italy. Cornelius Agrippa had written *De Nobilitate et Praecellentia Feminei Sexus* and Capella another treatise, *Della Eccellenza et Dignità delle Donne*. These two works, and there were others like them, formed the basis for William Bercher's *The Nobylytye of Wymen*.[48] Without confessing his indebtedness to his predecessors, Bercher explains that he is simply reproducing a conversation once heard by him in Italy. His book is long and tedious, but it contains some bright spots such as these: "Yf learnenge be a pretious guyft whye is yt not so in wymen also? . . . Yff men be afraide of wymen then let them go dwell in wyldernes"; and "thear wer lawes in Rome that no woman showlde grynde ne drudge in kytchyn." Bercher, then, by citing the example of Lady Jane Grey and other noble ladies, shows conclusively "what our wymen cann doo when they bende them selves to a matter worthy the travel." Of the same sort was Vives' *A very fruteful and pleasant booke called the instruction of a christen woman*.[49] But this has mainly a moral, rather than a cultural, aim. In all these works, woman's position is regarded as submission, and less concern was felt for her right training than for man's.

In the hands of Roger Ascham the fine ideal of the perfect courtier was given a still more restricted treatment; yet no

[47] *Faerie Queene*, 6. 1, 1.

[48] 1559. Roxburghe Club, London, 1904. See pp. 132, 147, 155.

[49] Published 1524. Translated into English by Richard Hyrde in 1541. I use the edition of 1557. A French translation appeared in 1543.

one can regret that the *Scholemaster* is the book it is. Ascham was one of the fine old scholars of St. John's College, Cambridge. Although he came of humble Yorkshire extraction, he became, under the tutelage of Sir John Cheke, one of the most learned men of the day,—an inspiration to the followers of the New Learning at the University and the favored tutor of Lady Jane Grey and the Princess Elizabeth. His open, genial disposition readily won him friends. He spoke enthusiastically about his university and lovingly of his teachers and pupils. And, although he was learned in Latin and Greek, his fervent love of England and his fondness for hearty English sports, yes, even of cockfighting and dicing, kept him from pedantry. All this sympathy for the young and keen insight into life and character are revealed in the first book of the *Scholemaster*.[50] But certain limitations kept Ascham from appreciating all sides of courtliness. He thought little of noble birth. At the University he became so deeply imbued with the spirit of Protestantism that he inclined in later life to regard education as a chief bulwark of the new religion. Finally, his position as the foremost teacher of his time restricted his active interests more and more to the methods of instruction useful for young English youth. His *Scholemaster,* therefore, belongs less to the subject of courtesy than to the field of education.

Ascham, however, knew and respected in part the ideal of courtesy. His hope was "that the youghte in England, speciallie Ientlemen, and namelie nobilitie, shold be by good bringing vp, so grounded in iudgement of learninge, so founded in loue of honestie, as, whan they should be called forthe to the execution of great affaires, in seruice of their Prince and countrie, they might be hable, to vse and to order, all experiences, . . . according to the square, rule, and line, of wisdom, learning, and vertue."[51] This is the end of courtesy as it was conceived in Italy. Indeed, Ascham expressly says that "to ioyne learnyng with cumlie exercises" is the lesson that "Conto Baldesœr Cas-

[50] Published 1570.
[51] *Scholemaster,* p. 63.

tiglione in his booke, *Cortegiane,* doth trimlie teach."[52] He felt that the reading of this book would benefit a young man more than three years of travel on the Continent. Finally, to study and actual experience Ascham would add exercise; "for it is well knowne, that I both like and loue, and haue alwaies, and do yet still vse, all exercises and pastimes, that be fitte for my nature and habilitie."[53]

Although Ascham in this way recognizes the ideal of a perfect character, he still departs noticeably from it. He has kept his eyes open at court and looks for little actual courtesy there, where "to follow, fawne, flatter, laugh and lie lustelie at other mens liking" are the rule. He has seen, too, that "some yong Ientlemen of oures, count it their shame to be counted learned," and fears lest "they count it their shame, to be counted honest also." He would not, like Spenser, expect true courtesy at the court, for he has observed things as they are. Despite all the Italians had said, he observed that "commonlie, the meaner mens children, cum to be, the wisest councellours, and greatest doers, in the weightie affaires of this Realme."[54]

As this fine old scholar turned from the court to the world to find true manhood, he altered noticeably the old ideals. "In writing this booke," he explains, "I haue had earnest respecte to three speciall pointes, trothe of Religion, honestie in liuing, right order in learning."[55] True courtliness hardly appears here. And Ascham scents danger even in learning, since many well-schooled men are found "vnfit to liue with others, and . . . vnapte to serue in the world."[56] Only godliness, then, remains unquestioned. To preserve that Ascham is ready to sacrifice much. He condemns the Italianate English who return from travel corrupted in morals. He censures, too, the "fonde bookes, of late translated out of Italian into English,"[57] that subvert

[52] *Scholemaster,* p. 66.
[53] *Ibid.,* p. 63.
[54] *Ibid.,* pp. 53, 60, 51.
[55] *Ibid.,* p. 23.
[56] *Ibid.,* p. 34.
[57] *Ibid.,* pp. 78-80.

both religion and morality. Rejecting thus all Italian culture, he pins his faith on the honesty and stability of the English heart. To develop that is true education, and for Englishmen the only courtliness is the perfecting of the best that England has to give.

Exactly the same tendencies are observable in the writings of another sixteenth-century educator, Richard Mulcaster, whom posterity has somewhat slighted to do honor to Ascham. Mulcaster, who served as head-master of the Merchant Taylors' School for twenty-five years and of St. Paul's for twelve, was a schoolman above all else. He too, therefore, thought more of actual needs than of a foreign ideal. He laid no great stress on birth, as we have seen, but sought the essence of true nobility in character—"wisedome in pollicie, valiance in execution, iustice in deciding, modestie in demeanour."[58] Of course, he divided English society into two great classes, the commonalty, consisting of merchants and "manuaries," and the gentility, made up of the gentlemen, the noblemen, and the prince. Nevertheless, he advocated the same education for gentlemen's sons as for others, on the ground that their minds are the same as poor youths' and their bodies often worse.[59] At least, the young gentlemen should not be educated privately. Private education "hatcheth moe odde ills," and moreover, since the gentry's "ordinarie greatnes is to gouerne our state, and to be publike pillers for the prince to leane on, and the people to staie by," public schools are to be preferred for them, where they may see the world in little.[60] This, of course, is the general idea of the *Courtier*. But Mulcaster's main end was quite different. "My purpose is to help the whole business of teaching, even from the very first foundation." He was ready to learn from the experience of others; but he insisted that "present circumstances must govern our use of authority."[61] On that basis he proposed

[58] *Positions*, p. 199. 1581.
[59] *Ibid.*, p. 66.
[60] *Ibid.*, pp. 184-194.
[61] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

to reorganize the universities and to alter the curriculum in the public schools so as better to meet the needs of English life. "The end of education and training is to help nature to her perfection in the complete development of all the various powers. . . . whereby each shall be best able to perform all those functions in life which his position shall require, whether public or private, in the interest of his country in which he was born, and to which he owes his service."[62]

More and more it became the practice of English reformers to discard the ideal of a gentleman, perfect in character, general accomplishments, and personal demeanor, and to consider only a single aspect of gentility. There were books on school training alone, and works on practical piety almost without number. Others considered one genteel accomplishment or another; there were books in England as in Italy on riding, fencing, conversation, and other lighter graces of the court. The French academies encouraged this change. In 1650 Sir Balthazar Gerbier opened such a school in London, in which these social accomplishments were stressed. More serious educators on their part strove to make the school curriculum more practical. William Petty, for example, in 1642 published his proposals for reform.[63] Even Milton yielded something to utilitarian demands and certainly emphasized the acquisition of knowledge rather than a natural, inward growth. The fact is, there was less apparent need in England than in Italy for the perfect courtier. In the small southern states there was a general call for service, at court, in diplomatic business, or in war. But in the larger life of England men left school to teach or preach, to manage their estates or follow one of the professions. Furthermore, as men of letters outgrew the financial dependence on the nobility that had hampered early humanists like Budé, their attitude toward the nobility was altered. Consequently, the courtly training lost its hold.

Naturally, therefore, the old book of courtesy disintegrated,

[62] *Positions*, p. 237.
[63] *Harleian Miscellany*, 6, pp. 141-158.

and its parts were assimilated by writings of other kinds. In 1603, Nicholas Breton published a collection of witty model letters, *A Poste with a Packet of Mad Letters*. Written in terse English, the letters are full of clever turns of thought, wise remarks, and bright anecdotes. One letter is entitled, *A Letter of Advice to a Young Courtier*. It shows plainly the influence of the character books and of Bacon's essays, but adds nothing else to our subject than a reference to Castiglione's book.[64] In another letter, Breton advises a young man about to enter the university. Although the ideas are not new, they indicate the practical, middle-class adaptation in England of the courtesy book. "Study all the Arts superficially," Breton counseled, "but chiefly Arithmetick, for it is the assured way to wealth: bee not ignorant in Diuinity: for it is the soules comfort: and take heed of Poetry, lest it run away with thy wit."

In the same way one of Joseph Hall's letters discusses the faulty education of the gentry. Holding himself the idea that birth is only "the body of Gentility" and that the "life and soule of it, is in noble and vertuous disposition," he regrets the idle life of the nobility. In other countries, "the sons of Nobles scorne not, either Marchandise, or learned professions, and hate nothing so much, as to do nothing. . . . Our gallants hold there can be no disparagement, but in honest callings."[65]

In another one of his little books, *The Courtier and the Country-Man,* Nicholas Breton contrasted the wholesome recreations and content of the country with the follies and vices of the town. We find here combined the spirit of pastoralism and such distrust of court life as is to be found in Guevara's *Menosprecio de la Corte*. Even more significant of changing ideals are three essays in Thomas Fuller's *Holy and Profane State*. Already Englishmen had learned to suspect the fully developed courtier or gentleman. Fuller, at least, begins his sketch of "the General Artist" with this admission: "I know the general cavil against general learning is this, that *aliquis in*

[64] See above, *Familiar Letters,* p. 105.
[65] *Epistles, the Third and Last Volume.* London, 1611. 4, 6, p. 37.

omnibus est nullus in singulis; he that sips of many arts drinks of none." Hence his separate sketches treat of the various functions of the one-time perfect Courtier—as Good Soldier, Good Judge, Wise Ambassador, and the like. Yet Fuller has courage enough to say something in behalf of the General Artist,—the man versed in ancient languages, skilled in logic and rhetoric, and well read in mathematics, history, cosmography, and divinity. He contrasts, also, two types of gentleman. The True Gentleman is well born, or at least of noble character; he is studiously inclined at the university and the Inns of Court; he is courteous, affable, and hospitable, and, whether as magistrate or knight of the shire, is an efficient public servant. The Degenerous Gentleman, on the contrary, idles his time at school and Inns of Court; wastes his patrimony in drinking and gaming; and "within two generations his name is quite forgotten." So the Italian ideal was by no means forgotten, although as a practical goal it was largely forsaken.

Fuller's observations on gentility, replete with his kindly knowledge of the world, contrast strongly with John Selden's coldly expressed views. "What a Gentleman is, 'tis hard with us to define, in other Countries he is known by his Privileges; in Westminster Hall he is one that is reputed one. The King cannot make a Gentleman of Blood . . . nor God Almighty, but he can make a gentleman by Creation. If you ask which is the better of these two, Civilly, the Gentleman of Blood, Morally the Gentleman by Creation may be the better; for the other may be a Debauch'd man, this a Person of worth."[66]

While the old-time, comprehensive books of courtesy were thus disintegrating and filtering through into newer types of literature, there still appeared in England interesting survivals of the school of Castiglione. One of the most interesting was John Cleland's *Institution of a Young Nobleman.*[67] Toward nobility Cleland took the old stand of the humanists; "it is not the great revenues, faire possessions, pleasant Palaces, manie

[66] *Table-Talk,* Gentlemen. See too Selden's *Titles of Honour,* 1614, Preface.
[67] Published in 1607.

Lordships and infinite riches, that can make a man Noble: al those thinges are but externall accidēts, subiect to the mutabilitie of Fortune, whereas Nobilitie is permanent in the minde." But virtue alone does not suffice; "hee onlie whose Vertue is profitable to the King and Countrie," and who in one laudable act after another is able to "continue in wel doing," is the true gentleman.[68]

Following still in the footsteps of Castiglione, Cleland recommends this training for the gentleman. "I would haue our Noble Pupill instructed in all Arts and Sciences. And therefore can I not marvaile enough at the impudēcie of manie, who dare vndertake the office of a Tutor." The boy ought first to be taught correct speech, reading, and writing; "I would have you assured and not amazed in your speech," Cleland observes.[69] Latin should next be added to the curriculum, and then French and Greek. Instruction must be given also in history, logic, mathematics, and law. To all this Cleland adds his advice on dress, gait, gestures, and man's deportment in general, as well as on his proper diversions and exercise. How clownish it is "to beate your bootes with a rod, bite your nailes, chew toothpickes, and talke only of your horses, hounds, of your losses at dice or cardes or any such cōmon place." And finally, all this comprehensive training should be perfected by travel, "the true science of Pollicie, and the good schoole of al gouernmēt."[70] But Cleland was sufficiently imbued with the prejudices of Ascham and the English party, to recommend first a tour of Britain, which he calls a "little abridgment of the great world." In short, Cleland's idea of the gentleman is modeled directly after that of the Italian courtier—a well-rounded character, able without any affectation to do honor to learning, the arts, and courtly life.

Cleland was old-fashioned enough, also, to regard the court as the true school of gentility. "Without offence to either of

[68] *Institution,* pp. 4, 5-6.
[69] *Ibid.,* p. 187.
[70] *Ibid.,* pp. 185, 251.

the famous Vniversities here, or our Colledges in Scotland for all sort of good learning, I recommend in particular the Academie of our noble Prince, where yoūg Nobles may learne the first elements to be a Privie Counseller, a Generall of an Armie, to rule in peace, & to cōmande in warre." For the court stood as "the true Panthaon of Great Britaine, where Vertue her selfe dwelleth by patterne, by practise, by encouragement, admonitions, & precepts of the most rare persons in Vertue and Learning that can be found." At court, one can learn more "in one month, then if hee should run ouer al France and Italie, in a yeare; yea his Highnesse Dinners and Suppers are an other Solomon's Table."[71]

Such respect for the court, which neither Ascham, Mulcaster, nor Milton shared, harmonizes ill with Cleland's opinion of his age. Like the unconscious humorist Stubbes, he turned disgusted from the fashions of the day. "So wee maie collect that the doubling of your cloakes, the fashion of your cloathes, the Jingling of your spurres, your swaggering, your swearing, and your refined oathes, horrible protestations, your odde humors, and your drinking of Tobacco with a whiffe, make not a Noble or a Gentleman."[72] Like Ascham, he found a general contempt for learning: "Ignorance is thought an essential marke of a Noble man by many. . . . Such is the miserie & blindnes of this vnhappie age, that manie growing in yeares professe nothing more then scoffing at learning & the professors thereof, in calling them al clerkes or pedants." But the Puritan educator himself was afraid of poetry, which he called a "minister of voluptuousnes."[73] He condemned also the customary speech of English gentlemen, which was not "plaine and perspicuous,"[74] but marred by "foolish affectation and verbal pride." Finally, he sanctioned recreation only in so far as it led directly to good and did not too much distract one from worthy pursuits. Hunt-

[71] *Institution,* pp. 35-36.
[72] *Ibid.,* pp. 4-5.
[73] *Ibid.,* pp. 134, 157.
[74] *Ibid.,* p. 185.

ing, for example, takes from the mind "al idle and naughtie cogitations" and makes a man "couragious and valiant," but is not to be encouraged at the expense of "necessarie affaires." So too hawking, tennis, and dancing are to be enjoyed in moderation only; for "there is nothing so good, but if it be vsed with excesse wil become bad."[75] Finally, to cap the Puritan trend of his thought, he enjoins: "As for the common plaiehouses, which may be called the verie sink of the Citty, I would neuer haue you resort thether."[76]

Less Puritan in its tendency and certainly far more entertaining is Henry Peacham's *Compleat Gentleman,* published first in 1622. In the Address to the Reader, Peacham acknowledged his indebtedness to those men who had written on the upbringing of youth—to Plutarch, Erasmus, Sir Thomas Elyot, Roger Ascham, and others. From all he borrowed freely, ideas on education, opinions on scores of worldly matters, anecdotes. But although he took without acknowledgment whatever suited his purpose, his book is full of individuality. "I have pleased my selfe," he asserted. And it is really true that this professional man of letters, handling these well-worn topics in his racy, natural idiom, was able to fill the *Compleat Gentleman* with his own alert, fresh personality.

Peacham approached the subject of nobility with a conservative English respect. He granted that noblemen may be better fed and clothed than the common people, may enjoy leisure for their sports, may even stand on a different footing in the courts of law. But these men, favored with leisure and wealth, should be truly noble; "riches are an ornament, not the cause of Nobility," and "hee that is ignoble and inglorious, may acquire Nobility by Vertue: the other may very well lose it by his Vice."[77]

Where Peacham repeated these favorite ideas of the old humanists, he managed to give them the coloring that comes

[75] *Institution,* pp. 222, 226.
[76] *Ibid.,* p. 229.
[77] *Compleat Gentleman,* 1622, pp. 9-10.

from personality and style. He approved of foreign travel whether for pleasure or profit; for "where may wisdome be had, but from many men, & in many places?"[78] Yet he may seem most to value travel since nothing else for a young man "setleth his affection more sure to his owne Country, then trauaile doth." He recommended the long-recognized accomplishments for the gentleman—a clear style in speaking and writing English and Latin, a knowledge of literature, music, the graphic arts, and cosmography. To this, however, he added his opinion of certain English poets, Thomas More, William Lilly, Sir Thomas Chaloner, Spenser, and Chaucer.[79] Spenser he merely named; neither Shakespeare nor any other dramatist was mentioned; but Chaucer was praised in that "under a bitter and rough rinde, there lyeth a delicate kernell of conceit and sweet invention," and in that he "saw in those times without his spectacles." So Peacham handled the old theories. He urged the value of some skill in music and painting, and qualified his approval as Castiglione and others had done. But his words were his own. You should be able "to sing your part sure, and at the first sight, withall, to play the same upon your Violl, or the exercise of the Lute, privately to your selfe."[80] But no noblemen should "prove a Master in the same, or neglect his more weighty imployments." In the same spirit he recommended practice in water colors, but advised against the more difficult painting in oil. Throughout the *Compleat Gentleman* a reader finds simply old ideas freshly handled.[81]

Peacham's book, too, is full of pictures of English life. Voicing the old complaint, for example, he wrote: "Now adaies, Parents either give their Children no education at all, . . . or if any, it leaveth so slender an impression in them, that like their names cut upon a Tree, it is over-growne with the old

[78] *Compleat Gentleman,* p. 235.
[79] *Ibid.,* p. 94.
[80] *Ibid.,* pp. 98, 100.
[81] Peacham wrote also an interesting book on the graphic arts, *The Gentlemans Exercise,* 1634.

barke by the next summer."[82] Again he said: "I cannot . . . but account the honest Merchant among the number of Benefactors to his Countrey, while he exposeth as well his life as goods, to the hazzard of infinite dangers."[83] He was liberal to teachers; he would not have "all Masters to be tyed to one Methode, no more than all the Shires of England to come up to London by one high way."[84] On the other hand, he was more sympathetic to boys than Lord Bacon, for he counsels: "Certainely it is a principall point of discretion in parents to be thoroughly acquainted with and obserue, the disposition and inclination of their children, and indeed for euery man to search into the addiction of his Genius, and not to wrest Nature as Musitians say, out of her key."[85] Peacham also stresses the utility of learning. "All Vertue consisteth in Action, and no man is borne for himselfe."[86] Study may contribute to life. Geometry is useful in campaigning; history, as Bodin shows, has been known to restore health; "musicke is a great lengthner of life. . . . The exercise of singing openeth the breast and pipes: it is an enemy to melancholly and dejection of the mind."[87] Such thoughts were long familiar in England.

One section in the book especially shows the newer and more personal interests of Peacham. Up to this time painting and sculpture had been almost unknown in England. In Peacham's day those arts were just beginning to be cultivated. He praised Lord Howard for adorning Arundel House with statuary, and Sir Kenelm Digby and Prince Charles for their active interest in the fine arts.[88] Peacham believed that "next men and manners there is nothing fairely more delightfull, nothing worthier observation, than these Copies, and memorials

[82] *Compleat Gentleman,* p. 31.
[83] *Ibid.,* p. 12. *Cf.* Breton, *Mad Letters,* and Addison.
[84] *Ibid.,* p. 27.
[85] *Ibid.,* p. 34.
[86] *Ibid.,* p. 2.
[87] *Ibid.,* pp. 52-53, 98.
[88] *Ibid.,* pp. 105-108.

of men and matters of elder times."[89] So here and in *The Gentlemans Exercise* Peacham gives one of the first English essays on the graphic arts.

These excerpts from *The Compleat Gentleman* amply show, I think, how rich in homely phrase and apt illustration the treatise is. It is filled, also, with entertaining anecdote. He tells the story of the Duke of Wirtenberg's boxing the ears of his old tutor, for not having forced him to study in youth.[90] Fuller includes this story in *The Holy and Profane State*. Peacham has other more racy anecdotes to tell. Two young German students, after a long stay at an inn, were unable to meet the landlord's bill. So, as they were about to depart, one of them explained to the gaping host, that, according to Plato's idea, in thirty-six thousand years the world would again be where it then was and they would be again at the inn, better provided with ready cash. The story continues: "Quoth mine Host, I believe it to be true: and I remember sixe and thirty thousand yeeres a goe you were heare, and left just such a reckoning behind to pay. I pray you Gentlemen discharge that first, and I will trust you for the next."[91]

On the whole, Peacham impresses the reader as a man of letters, less well educated and less Puritanical than Cleland, and so able to inject into this sort of book something of his own interesting personality. Two other books show how the old ideal of a gentleman was modified by middle-class Puritan sentiment. One is called the *Mirrour of Worldly Fame*.[92] Its author starts with the philosopher's customary view of nobility. "To boast our pedigree," he says, "which we fetch from others, and not bestowed upon us for our deserts, is a thing very ridiculous"; for "true nobility is not hereditary." He preaches, then, in Puritan fashion against idleness, though his argument, "when we sleep, and are at our pastimes, Death creepeth upon us,"

[89] The section on armorial designs is also interesting.
[90] *Compleat Gentleman*, p. 20.
[91] *Ibid.*, pp. 58-59.
[92] Published in 1603 by I. H. *Harleian Miscellany*, 2, pp. 515-535.

would apply as well to work or devotion. Regardless of Castiglione's recognition of dancing, if he knew of it, the English moralist censures the diversion "from which nothing proceedeth, but that which favoureth lust, hateful to every honest man, and ought, in general, to be a disgrace to all." He despises, too, a concern for dress, on the ground that "variety of cloathing doth not so much adorn a man, as it doth discredit him," and he advises the gentleman to give up perfumes and be content "to savour of virtue and honesty." The tract is thoroughly Puritan.

The other Puritan courtesy-book, Richard Brathwaite's *The English Gentleman,* is much more comprehensive. The work fills over two hundred and fifty folio pages, and almost as many more are devoted to the portrayal of *The English Gentlewoman.* For this the author himself is constrained to apologize. "I had purposed that this worke should have been digested into a portable Volume, to the end that it might bee more familiar with a Gentlemans pocket. . . . But since the Volume would not beare it, you must with patience beare with it, and with more trouble beare it, by inlarging your pocket to containe it."[93]

The general temper of Brathwaite's treatise is plainly revealed in the long dedicatory epistle. "I am here to tender unto your Honours judicious view, a Gentleman, quite of another garbe: One, whose Education hath made formall enough, without apish formality, and conceiving enough, without self-admiring arrogancy. A good Christian in devout practising, no lesse than zealous professing; yet none of the forward'st in discoursing on Religion. . . . Hee esteemes such onely happy, who are of that number, whom the World accounts fooles, but God, wise men. He understands, that whatsoever is sought besides God, may so imploy the Minde, as it may be occupied, but never satisfied. Hee observes the whole Fabrike of humane power, and he concludes with the Preacher; Ecquid tam vanum! Hee notes how the Flesh becomming obedient, behaveth her selfe as a faithfull servant to the Soule. . . . Finally, hee summes up all his Observations with this: Hee that Sigheth not

[93] Published in 1630. I use the third edition of 1641.

while hee is a Pilgrim, shall never rejoyce when he is a Citizen. This is the Gentleman, whom I have here againe presumed to recommend to your protection: and to you he makes recourse, not so much for shelter, as honour: for his Title, it exempts him from servile bashfulnesse, being an English Gentleman."

Between this passage and the teachings of the humanists a marked difference is felt. Brathwaite seems wholly concerned with Godliness, as something to be added to human character. He stresses obedience and humility and would repress the assertion of individuality that was so highly prized in Castiglione's day. He says nothing of that *vertù* which was the Italian ideal.

Brathwaite's bias is still further revealed in the opening section of *The English Gentleman*. Unconcerned for the true culture of the mind and the harmonious development of spiritual life, he regards youth only "as a dangerous time, in respect of those Sinne-spreading Sores which soile and blemish the glorious image of the Soule."[94] Instead of emphasizing the value of correct and fluent speech, Brathwaite remembers that "the tongue (as one observes) is a small member; but very glibbery and prone to ruine."[95] So too in the Puritan way, he handles the youth's dress, his general bearing, and conduct, conscious not of the good that is within man's reach, but only of the evil. "As the substance of the Soule is pure, so this masse of flesh is corrupt: staine not the purity of the former, by conversing with the latter: for to parley with so subtill an enemy, is to give way to his policy."[96]

One need not wonder, then, that in this encyclopedic treatise Brathwaite can allot only fifteen pages to education.[97] "Education," as he understands it, "is the Seasoner or instructesse of Youth, in principles of Knowledge, Discourse, and Action. Of all inferiour knowledges, none more behoovefull than the knowledge of Mans-selfe; of all superiour, none more usefull

[94] *The English Gentleman*, p. 1.
[95] *Ibid.*, p. 7.
[96] *Ibid.*, p. 9.
[97] *Ibid.*, pp. 43-57.

nor divinely fruitfull than the knowledge of God, who for Man gave himselfe." He warns young men to beware of affectation and imitation, and to be sober and truthful in speech. His section on education concludes with an exhortation beginning, "Dear Christians."

In this didactic, pietistic fashion the book proceeds. The chapter on Vocation is a sermon against idleness, for which no man is excusable; "the higher place the heavier charge." Recreations are good, even the theatre, though "if we exceed, they must needs grow hurtfull." But the ordinary gentlemen are idle or vicious; "they leave their beds to put on their clothes formally, repaire to an Ordinary, and see a Play daily."[98] It is interesting to find Brathwaite on the subject of Acquaintance quoting Bacon's words, "Wives are young men's mistresses," as Cleland had quoted his familiar classification of books. The book closes with a long "character" of the gentleman, which is fairly summed up in the sentences: "He holds it the sweetest life to be every day better, till length of dayes reunite him to his Redeemer. Hee hath plaid his part on this Stage of Earth with honour; and now in his Exit makes heaven his harbour."

The English Gentlewoman, which also ends in a long "character," is in perfect keeping with the companion volume. Clearly, as the old ideal of gentility was removed from court, it had been greatly altered. Brathwaite's own epigram on the Courtier in *A Strappado for the Diuell* shows how little confidence was then retained for the court. In this he differed from Cleland.[99]

As the ideal of the true gentleman was thus gradually changing in England, the concept of true womanhood remained more stationary. The position of freedom and equality that women enjoyed in the court of Urbino was not realized elsewhere; for

[98] *The English Gentleman,* pp. 96, 109.

[99] Caleb Trenchfield's *A Cap of Gray Hairs for a Green Head: or, the Fathers Counsel to his Son,* 1671, 5th edition, 1710, is a book for the apprentice, dealing with religion, veracity, temperance, frugality, and other such matters.

Vives and Erasmus and other early educators were concerned in preparing them for a life of submission, either in the convent or the home. Protestantism still further restricted their opportunity, by removing the chance for a conventual training. In 1623 Elizabeth Joselyn's *Letter to an Unborn Child* treated mainly of the duties of the home. It was not until the latter part of the century that a wider outlook was taken. *The English Gentlewoman, The Ladies Calling,* and, in 1678, George Savile's *Advice to a Daughter,* all show that the conduct of women was the subject of great concern. But Mary Astell was almost the first to urge full intellectual opportunities for her sex. Her *Serious Proposal* claimed the fullest educational opportunities for women. But, till they were won, the discussion of the lady's calling, as it was termed, was necessarily restricted and unproductive.[100]

Not all the works of the seventeenth century were gripped as Brathwaite's was by Puritan feeling. Francis Osborne's *Advice to a Son,*[101] incomplete as it is, was the direct precursor of Lord Chesterfield's *Letters.* He had little to say on formal education, beyond expressing his preference for the public school, where boys "by plotting to rob an Orchard, &c. run through all the Subtilties required in taking of a Town," and so gain experience at no greater hazard than of a whipping. He advised the son to learn something of medicine, since "the intricacy of the Study is not great." But for the most part his instruction bears only on the superficial aspects of conduct. "Be not frequent in Poetry, how excellent soever your vein is," he counseled. Music, he asserted, is "unable to refund for the Time and Cost required to be perfect therein." More often his advice had to do with mere dress, health, or manners. We know that Samuel Pepys, "not being neat in clothes" one day, remembered "my father Osborne's rule" and "rode straight-

[100] See the interesting chapter in Florence M. Smith's *Mary Astell,* New York, 1916.

[101] 1656. Printed 1658.

way home by coach."[102] Osborne's most sensible advice, possibly, is on speech, if we except his words of wisdom on tobacco, "the use of which I neither persuade nor prohibit, having taken it my self since sixteen, without any extraordinary marks of good or ill." On language he advised one to "avoid Words or Phrases likely to be learned in base company." Other bits of sensible advice are these: "Spend no time in reading, much less writing Strong lines"; "the way to Elegancy of stile, is to employ your Pen upon every Errand. . . . And if void of Affectation, it matters not how mean the subject is." Osborne reminds the reader of Lord Chesterfield rather than of Castiglione, for he was concerned chiefly with only one of the many-sided courtier's attainments.

It was the misogyny of Francis Osborne, however, that aroused most interest and opposition. "Eve, by stumbling at the Serpent's solicitations, cast her Husband out of Paradise: nor are her Daughters surer of foot, being foundered by the heat of Lust and Pride." Such prejudice drew from John Heydon a reply, entitled *Advice to a Daughter, in Opposition to the Advice to a Sonne.* And this in turn prompted from Osborne's friend, Thomas Pecke, the travesty called *Advice to Balaam's Ass.*[103] Here we are, though, far from the spirit of the Renaissance, in the midst of such personal amenities as enlivened the days of Swift and Pope.

So the writers of the latter part of the seventeenth century preserved one aspect or another of the humanist's ideal. Francis Markham in *The Booke of Honour* took the courtier's point of view. He dedicated each of the many sections of his book to some prominent man, and gave the greatest amount of space to the discussion of the various ranks of nobility. And although he admitted that virtue alone can raise a man to nobility, he added that such elevation should never be "without the Princes knowledge. For it is not a matter of meane and indifferent re-

[102] *Diary,* Oct. 19, 1661.
[103] See *D. N. B., s. v.,* Thomas Pecke and John Heydon.

gard, for a vulgar or meane person to be raised to Honour or Nobilitie."[104]

The other extreme, godliness, was stressed by Clement Ellis in *The Gentile Sinner*.[105] The book opens with censure of the gallant and the "degenerate gentleman." Next, Ellis portrays the true gentleman in a way to drive honest men into other camps. Ellis' true gentleman cannot even buy a suit of clothes without considering what "cloath or stuff . . . may please God hereafter upon the Beggars back," nor speak even casually without showing that he "intends no lesse then to give you a tast of his soul at every word." Ellis admits that he is confounding the gentleman and the Christian, but justifies his action on the plea that "there is such a necessary Connexion betwixt these two, that they seem to be no more then the Different Names of the same man." Not inconsistently, then, he recommends two books for the perusal of his readers—*The Gentleman's Calling*, another one of these degraded courtesy-books, and *The Whole Duty of Man*, a book of practical piety, by the same author probably, that exerted a great influence on Puritan people.[106] With these volumes one should name, also, *The Ladies Calling*, a type of book that goes back at least to a letter composed by St. Jerome for his sister's benefit.

Another work that approaches the subject more broadly and with less Puritan prejudice is Panton's *Speculum Juventutis*.[107] At the castle of Tinoe, in Deucalia, a stranger narrates to some Good Samaritans who have relieved him in his distress, the story of his faulty early training and his ill-advised passion. But each time that the story gets under way, some auditor interrupts to give his views on the proper rearing of youth. So we have long disquisitions on the origin and nature of no-

[104] *The Booke of Honour*, 1625, p. 50.

[105] *The Gentile Sinner*, 3d ed. Oxford, 1664, pp. 167, 178.

[106] *The Gentleman's Calling*, 1660.

[107] *Speculum Juventutis: or, a true Mirror where Errors in Breeding Noble and Generous Youth, with the Miseries and Mischiefs that usually attend it, are clearly made Manifest.* London, 1671.

bility, on the need for a young gentleman to study, on the proper way of entering court life, and on dueling. Panton is as far removed from the Puritan as from the humanist. He recognized care for clothing as "a necessary evil in men of your age," and would allow gaming "at such times as Honour and Complaisance to the Company shall oblige you." Then in speaking of the young gentleman's education, he asked: "What has he to do with Greek or Hebrew Poesie, or Latin, Rhetorick, or all those trifling Entertainments?" Instead, the boy should be taught English, history, geography, moral philosophy, and mathematics, as well as riding, fencing, dancing, vaulting, drawing, music, and modern languages, and should be allowed two or three years of travel. So the book represents neither Puritanism nor humanism, and, couched in the form of romance, belongs strictly to the new age with its new sentiments.[108]

Yet the books continued to appear in endless succession. For American readers Lingard's *Letter of Advice to a Young Gentleman leaving the University* has an especial interest, since it was probably the first book printed in New York City.[109] Another volume, *Of Education, especially of Young Gentlemen,* after a number of essays on the duties of parents, tutor, and pupil, gathers from Della Casa and other Italian authors the long-familiar rules of etiquette. About the same time a work by Baltazar Gracian was translated as *The Courtiers Manual Oracle* and the *Discorsi* of Romei as *The Courtiers Academie.* Still another compilation appeared in 1722 as *Instructions for Youth, Gentlemen, and Noblemen.* It contained, in addition to the letters on conduct of Sir Walter Raleigh and Lord Burghley, Sermonetta's advice to a cousin, about to enter the service of the Duke of Parma in Flanders, and Edward Walsingham's *Arcana Aulica,* a translation of Eustache du Refuge's *Traité de la Cour, ou Instruction des Courtisans.* Till the very end,

[108] *Speculum Juventutis,* pp. 185, 186, 285-290.

[109] London, 1671. Reprinted by William Bradford, New York, 1696. The book is rather colorless and not especially designed for college men.

then, English treatises on manners and character were strongly influenced by continental ideals.[110]

Two books, therefore, might be taken in conclusion, for consideration. One is *The Gentlemans Monitor* by Edward Waterhouse.[111] In spirit and content it is strictly English. To restore the ancient nobility and gentry of England, for example, the author recommends piety in living, fit training of youth, a postponement of foreign travel till years of discretion are attained, and a study of the laws and usages of England. Waterhouse was a graduate of Cambridge, and the author of a work on heraldry called *The Sphere of Gentry*.[112]

The other treatise, *The Courtiers Calling,* is as thoroughly French as *The Gentlemans Monitor* is English in its spirit. We have found that it is simply a literal translation of Jacques de Callières' *La Fortune des Gens de Qualité,* published in Paris in 1658. Naturally, the old Italian ideal has been supplanted by a later Parisian ideal. In the first place, the principle of expediency is dominant throughout the book. Culture and refinement for their own intrinsic worth concern the author less than the making of one's fortune at court. He considers the different avenues to success open to the young courtier. Regarding the court as a place "always full of Intrigues," where "Fraud and Dissimulation reign," he discusses the tactful attitude toward friends and enemies. And though he thinks little of marriages for money, he nevertheless recognizes such unions "when our Lands are Mortgaged, and our Houses beset with Serjeants." "To nick the time" is one means of success at court.[113]

In the second place, the reason that prescribed sanity and moderation in the literature of Boileau's time and Addison's, appears as the guiding principle of the book. The young court-

[110] The *Traité* was published in 1617, was first translated into English by John Reynolds in 1622, and was translated again by Walsingham in 1652. I use the edition of 1655.

[111] London, 1665.

[112] See above, p. 39.

[113] *The Courtiers Calling,* 1675, pp. 18, 90, 28.

ier "ought to wear such a garb as he can maintain a long time, and which may secure him from the disgrace of falling into Bayliffs clutches. . . . It is not the property of a discreet man to contract Debts." The same applies to the table; for "what we do without discretion, cannot be well done."[114] So he takes toward trade the sensible attitude that Addison was soon to take, and regrets that younger sons are forced by public sentiment into lives of idleness. "A Gentleman may very well be a Merchant."[115] Often, however, this practical knowledge of the world chains reason to expediency, and his ideas are then no more uplifting than this: "The greatest Worth in the world buried under indigence, is a mine of Gold which no man has discovered."[116]

The author's general tone, therefore, is like that of Lord Chesterfield. "Lying is always weak of itself," he remarked, and "A man of Sense findes out so many Reasons which oblige him to embrace Vertue, that it is easie to him to resolve. . . . No-body takes pleasure in being accounted wicked."[117] Although he adds that real honesty carries farther than pretence, his idea of gentlemanliness is that of Chesterfield. Too many men can be sent to the universities to "loyter under tutors." They remain ill-bred. It would be better for the young man "to bring him forth early into the World, to prescribe him select discourses, to oblige him to make his Court to persons of Quality, to make him observe all the Punctilio's of a gentile and courteous deportment; to give him a certain boldness in all his actions, without impudence or affectation; to render him civil without debasing himself, and complaisant without flattering others; to enjoyn him the conversation of Ladies, and permit him to carry on some intrigues with them." "The World is a great Book, which instructs us continually."[118]

[114] *The Courtiers Calling*, pp. 72, 74.
[115] *Ibid.*, pp. 119-123.
[116] *Ibid.*, p. 97.
[117] *Ibid.*, p. 63.
[118] *Ibid.*, pp. 194, 198, 207, 212.

Hence the author abandons the respect for learning that the true humanists felt. He himself was "more indebted to Nature than to my Tutours"; "having spent more than half of my life in Armies, I have had little converse with Books, but have applied my self chiefly to the study of the World."[119] He wanted the courtier to be acquainted with affairs, for not to know history, geography, and poetry, would render him dull and graceless. He felt that youth had been hampered by too close study of Latin and Greek, "which are no Sciences but petty Tyrants," and by submission to the authority of Aristotle. He himself would account a secretary's post honorable. But the public, he admitted, called it degrading and young gentlemen preferred other forms of service. "It is more noble to fill his Master Drink at his meals, than to explain his thoughts and intentions in his Letters; . . . it is more honourable to dress Horses and whip Pages, than to converse with Embassadors, and be the Confident of the most important Secrets between the Court and him."[120] Though the author may disapprove of this, his own ideal was much the same. Old ideals had greatly changed.

So the old-time books of courtesy and of etiquette, that had come from Italy to England in the sixteenth century, lived on for two hundred years and more. To trace their progress is no easy matter. Even when the influence of Italy governed English thought, Italian treatises often reached London from Paris. So, for example, the first English translator of Della Casa's *Galateo* followed a French translation more closely than the original. Moreover, the old terms courtier and gentleman suffered constant changes of meaning. The diffusion of England's courtly life through so many remote country estates; the strong hold gained by Puritan ideals; new and more utilitarian views on education,—all these greatly altered the Italian ideal. Richard Steele lamented the degradation of the term,

[119] *The Courtiers Calling*, p. 194.
[120] *Ibid.*, pp. 184-185, 190-195.

gentleman, in his day.[121] Lord Chesterfield's *Letters* then represented most nearly the old concern for behavior, as Daniel Defoe's *Compleat English Gentleman* voiced middle-class, Puritan sentiment. And when a French work was translated, it was apt to be one, like the Abbot of Bellegarde's *Polite Tutor*, that laid emphasis on politeness alone. The old conception of a perfectly rounded character thus disappeared. Much, therefore, can be learned from these old books of courtesy and etiquette regarding the language, the manners, and the social ideals of the English people.

[121] *Tatler*, nos. 16, 66.

A REPRESENTATIVE MAN OF LETTERS

IN the foregoing essays the name of Joseph Hall has been frequently mentioned. Among the many writers of characters in the seventeenth century, he was the first Englishman to observe faithfully the model of Theophrastus. His position as a letter writer was the same; for, although the familiar letter was in his time centuries old, it was not yet acclimated in England when he published his *Epistles* as "a new fashion of discourse." Furthermore, he contributed his little, in several letters, to the literature of courtesy. Even more notable was his leadership in the development of classical satire in verse, that interesting survival of an old Roman type, which, owing to the rigor of the Lord Mayor of London, was soon suppressed —"no sooner blown but blasted." Finally, in addition to all this pioneer work in these several fields, Hall wrote poetry and sermons and as a pamphleteer rushed to defend the bishops against the fury of the Root and Branch petitioners. Unquestionably, Hall deserves to be remembered as somewhat more than the luckless opponent of Milton and the "dutiful son of the church."

But Hall was no more representative of the varied literary activity of the day than was Thomas Fuller. He began his career in 1631 with a long poem on David's sin, repentance, and punishment. About eight years later he appeared as an historian of the Holy War. Then in 1642 he published in *The Holy and Profane State* his characters and Baconian essays, and in 1645, his first collection of reflective, moralizing paragraphs quaintly called *Good Thoughts in Bad Times*. Finally, after other incursions in geography and history, of which his *Pisgah-Sight of Palestine* is the most interesting, and two more series of Thoughts and Meditations, he garnered in *The*

Worthies of England the fruits of his long, antiquarian researches in his country's history. Deterred from publication by the execution of King Charles, the loyal author did not live to send his work to press; "for what shall I write," he lamented, "of the worthies of England, when this horrid act will bring such an infamy upon the whole nation, as will ever cloud and darken all its former and suppress its future rising glories?"

Fuller was born in 1608, the year of Milton's birth, at Aldwinkle, in Northamptonshire, where his father was rector. Accustomed from boyhood to theological discussions between his father and uncle, he learned early to handle difficult questions then under debate. At the age of thirteen he entered Queens' College, Cambridge, and received his first degree in 1624 and his second degree in 1628. He then remained at Cambridge for a time as curate of St. Benet's, where he preached the funeral sermon of the famous carrier, Hobson. At the university, therefore, Fuller was the contemporary of Milton, Jeremy Taylor, George Herbert, Edmund Waller, and other less celebrated men. And to the university the great-hearted man remained always loyal. During the Puritan war he spent a short time in the court at Oxford. The seventeen weeks there, he noted, cost him as much as his seventeen years at the rival institution. But he had left that pleasant environment before the outbreak of hostilities and had lived as rector in Dorsetshire and as a popular preacher in London. Soon his longing for reconciliation and peace brought him into difficulties, first with his Puritan auditors in London and then with the King at Oxford. So, having been deprived of his London audience and cast into the ill favor of his king, he found himself a chaplain in Sir Ralph Hopton's command, and a moving spirit in the obstinate defence of Basing House. After the termination of the war, he settled again in London, where the popular clergyman preached customarily to two congregations, one seated in the church and the other listening through the open windows. In London he died in the year 1661.

The charm of Fuller's personality is as strong to-day as it

ever was. In physique he was tall and heavy. From the statement of his earliest biographer that he was moderate in eating and drinking and indeed all other habits, the modern reader would except only study and composition. The merely physical labor of transcribing all that he wrote would be the task of almost a lifetime. His sole recreation was forced upon him by his experiences in the army, and in London, in late life, his only exercise consisted in going to and fro from his house to the printer's, on which occasions, we are told, his mind ran as fast as his legs. But the reader soon grows to like the indefatigable old student. He looked out on life with wide-open eyes, and noticed closely and kindly the ways of ordinary men and women of the world. For all he had a genuine tolerance and sympathy. His views were practical and sane. But there was somewhere a strange, "diverting twist" to his mind, and his expression is filled with quaint turns of thought. Possibly he is best known for these refractions of intellect. And he, indeed, would be a stupid reader who cannot enjoy the author's strange plays of fancy and even his puns. But no one should allow these accidental features of his work to blind one to the genuinely human temperament of the man. Something presumably was lost as Fuller transmitted his thoughts to writing; but that something could hardly be the rare personality that he possessed.

Fuller's character sketches have already been described. But between the two divisions of *The Holy and Profane State* stands a group of essays in the style of Lord Bacon. Fuller handled the same sort of subject. In development he more often followed the method—by division—of Bacon's longer essays. Yet Fuller, too, as all his works show, had a knack for terse, epigrammatic phrase. Bacon himself might have written statements like these: "measure not thy entertainment of a guest by his estate, but thine own," and "it is unnatural for a man to court and hug solitariness. . . . Yet a desert is better than a debauched company." Within the limits allowed by his pattern, Fuller could hardly let his quaint habits of mind play freely. He curbed his inclination for conceits, and only occa-

sionally is the reader surprised by such a quaint fancy as this: "the Pisans, sited in the fens and marshes of Arnus, have excellent memories, as if the foggy air were a cap for their heads." Because of his Baconian pattern, also, Fuller's historical examples and anecdotes could be only sparingly indulged in. A rich man once told a poor fellow that he walked to get a stomach for his meat. "And I," said the poor man, "to get meat for my stomach." This is distinctly like Fuller. Had he followed the pattern of Montaigne, he need not have repressed his fondness for such historical application and pat anecdote. Lord Bacon imposed greater restraint. Shrewd sense, a kindly disposition, and a finely tempered mind raise Fuller's essays in human qualities above Lord Bacon's, though of course in literary technique and diction they fall far short of their model.

As a writer of pious meditations Fuller's peculiar genius was less trammeled than in the essay. His *Good Thoughts in Bad Times, Good Thoughts in Worse Times, and Mixed Contemplations in Better Times,* are a veritable storehouse of odd moralizings, apt and timely anecdote, curious illustration with far-fetched application, and homely reflection. There are anecdotes of returned soldiers, country divines, Quakers and Anabaptists, jailors, and roguish students. That witches say their prayers backward is not inexplicable to Fuller. His love of peace is confirmed by reflection on the origin of the name Minden—"Mein-Dein"—and his aversion to dissent is expressed in his opinion that the grammarians' conjunction disjunctive is no more an anomaly than the church's communion disuniting. He mentions children in new shoes who avoid the mud, and London shopkeepers who "ever sing the same thing, that trading is dead." He even concludes: "it is false that the marigold follows the sun, whereas the sun follows the marigold, as made the day before him." In these meditations all the interests of the many-sided author find play. The titles themselves, where they are supplied, are alluring. For his moral lessons, the author is never at a loss for an illustration, from the Bible or history

or science or life; and, conversely, nowhere in history or daily life is there a fact from which an application cannot be drawn.

Fuller, however, would doubtless have us read his work for edification. Each paragraph offers some shrewd reflection on life or some advice on conduct. Of them all, the Personal Meditations are possibly the finest. These are full of interesting, and it seems sincere self-confessions. At one time Fuller discovered an "arrant laziness" in his soul, as he found himself, on beginning a chapter in the Bible, glancing ahead to see its length. Or he regretted remembering a "profane jest" heard almost twenty years before, whereas "many pious passages of far later date" were utterly forgotten. Again, he cried out, "Lord, this day I am casually fallen into a bad company"; but he never specified as Samuel Pepys, who married Fuller's niece, would have done. The last series of meditations begins with the reflection, "How easy is pen and paper piety for one to write religiously." Thoughts like these, which in the hands of less gifted men degenerated into books of practical piety, are here shot through and through with the personality of the genial, tolerant, and widely experienced author.

In his sacred poems, character sketches, essays, and, to a less degree, these pious moralizings, Fuller showed his contact with the contemporary world of letters. Other works reveal his scholarly pursuits. Like all well-read men of his time Fuller took the keenest interest in geography. One thinks of the blind poet, Milton, carefully inquiring of a friend the price of a newly published atlas, or of the poet Donne, with his avowed interest in maps and globes. Indifference on those matters would have been almost impossible in the age just following the great period of discovery and exploration. Fuller never traveled. But Peter Heylyn, also, had scarcely been beyond the borders of his own country when he wrote a huge Cosmographie and stood as Fuller's doughty opponent.

Fuller's geographical and historical writings are inseparably joined. His *Historie of the Holy Warre* is illustrated by the most interesting maps, and the *Pisgah-Sight of Palestine* is

filled with Biblical history. No one would care to read either in a modern edition. Without the interesting pictorial title-pages, the quaintly illustrated maps, and the general appearance of age in the books, his history would seem inaccurate and "undocumented." Fuller lived in an older world, when scholarship could walk abroad untrussed, and when even sacred history could be interlarded with the humorist's "scraps of trencher jests."

The title-page of the *Holy Warre* is so obvious in meaning that the explanatory poem accompanying it is a needless literary display. At the top of the old folio-page, in the centre, stands the picture of a church and beside it a well-filled purse, "warres surest nerve." From the church issues the stately procession of Crusaders and winds its way down the margin on the left. Peter the Hermit leads with his trumpet; then follow a company of kings on horseback, a group of knights and high ecclesiastics, and a crowd of lowly friars. After them come a solid square of soldiers, a number of ladies well mounted, and a mob of beggars and cripples. Finally, they reach Jerusalem, which is represented by a ruined temple. From it the adventurers wind their way back along the margin to the right. First an angel of the Lord smites the "perfidious soules." Next a "surly, black Saracen" threatens a party of kneeling Christians with a scimitar almost as large as the church. Lastly, Death with dart and spear overthrows the stragglers, so that only one horseman and three terrified footmen make the final dash past the empty purse and into the church from which the procession started. No modern title-page, with its meagre array of facts for bibliographers, can so whet the curiosity of the reader as the pages in these generous old folios do.

The maps, also, are illustrated with quaint pictures. Moses stands on Mount Pisgah with staff and, one infers, a Baedeker in hand. Armies clash on the plains of Palestine; men pursue evil-doers at point of sword into cities of refuge; Job sits in sackcloth at the door of his tent; rivers rise from great caverns in hillsides. Longitude and latitude are left unmarked, for pub-

lishers then were apt to count costs closely. But Fuller inserts a scale of miles and warns the reader not to apply it to the historical pictures, else "some men would appear Giants, yea monsters, many miles long."

In these maps Fuller is not only often inaccurate but even defends his mistakes. "Of thirty mapps and Descriptions of the Holy Land" that he had examined, he had "never met with two in all considerables alike." Hence he could do no more than follow Scripture, and when Biblical statements proved ambiguous, "umpire"—that is split—the difference between his secular authorities. The exaction of greater precision would be unjust to the historian, for then "Gally-slaves would be in a more freer condition than Geographers." He craved of the reader, therefore, excuse, "were it but for the shaking of his weary hand in so tedious a work." To the numerous criticisms of his stubborn opponent, Peter Heylyn, he thus found usually an answer; or, if answer there were none, he frankly admitted his error—"I have seen my error, and *you* see my retraction thereof. One day teacheth another." Fuller really was much in earnest, and, if some of his explanations are amusing, one must blame the personality, not the intent, of the author.

Fuller's quaintly phrased justification of his interest in history is not far remote from the more seriously expressed arguments of Lord Bolingbroke and Carlyle. History, Fuller admits, is "a velvet-study, & recreation-work." He feels only pity for a fine gentleman who has "such a crick in his neck that he cannot look backward," and equal pity for one "who cannot see behind him the actions which long since were performed." He believes that "history maketh a young man to be old, without either wrinkles or gray haires; priviledging him with the experience of age, without either the infirmities or inconveniences thereof." It enables a man, also, "to make rationall conjecture of things to come." Such argument is still current coin.

In other respects the histories of Fuller abound in queer turns of thought and fantastic digressions. He wrote "Of the present wofull condition of the Jews; and of the small hope, and great

hindrances of their conversion." He gave a chapterful of arguments for the Crusaders, and then, as an impartial historian, a chapterful of arguments against them. Or, to convince the reader that Palestine might support the large population then attributed to it, he reminded him that in eastern countries persons do not have such "hot appetites" and "gluttonous palates," and that a very hilly country contains many acres of ground "whereof no notice is taken in a map." Even in the most serious parts of the history many strange turns of expression are found; for example, he ends the story of the angel's visitation with the words, "whereupon Jacob carried an upright heart and lame leg to his grave." Hence Peter Heylyn could object to the "scraps of trencher-jests interlarded" in all parts even of the *Church History*. Yet Fuller wrote as a serious student, hoping that "the faults of this book [may] redound to my self; the profit to others; the glory to God." But his temperament could not be repressed. In closing his long history, he wrote: "Thus, after an hundred and ninety and four years, ended the Holy War; for continuance the longest, for money spent the costliest, for bloodshed the cruellest, for pretences the most pious, for the true intent the most politic, the world ever saw. And at this day, the Turks, to spare the Christians their pains of coming so long a journey to Palestine, have done them the unwelcome courtesy to come more than half way to give them a meeting."

In his antiquarian studies Fuller's eccentric genius had even freer play, and his *Worthies of England* will doubtless remain, what it always has been, his most popular work. Comparing England to a house, "not very great but convenient" and "the several Shires . . . to the rooms thereof," and recognizing that "learned Master Camden and painful Master Speed" had described the rooms, he set out to record the furnishings—the persons, commodities, and all other "observables." He saw that "some Shires, Joseph-like, had a better coloured coat than others," yet all had some riches, "as if God in some sort observed gavel-kind in the distribution of his favours." So for

each county he gathered his records of its natural commodities, manufactures, wonders, buildings, local proverbs, and famous men.

It seems a dull subject indeed, but not a page is unenlivened by some bit of interesting fact or fantastic thought. In the gathering of material, Fuller conversed with persons of all sorts, giving "money and cheerful thanks besides" to aged sextons and clerks who satisfied his curiosity. He carried his manuscripts with him as he rode in the king's army, and actually tried to arrange his gleanings while the Puritan siege guns were turned against Basing House. So his material is varied and thoroughly his own. Often it is with real gusto that he mentioned the products of a county, as the strawberries that grew so thick that riders could pick them from the saddle. If he cites a proverb it is, like that of the Vicar of Bray, well known and not one that has "never traveled beyond the smoke of the chimneys" of its native town. Fanciful etymologies are to be found for the interest of the student. There are biographies of well-known men, enlivened by anecdotes like that of Raleigh's coat of many colors; notices of Thomas Chaucer and other sons of great men; and stories of poor boys who became famous. Bits of narrative, like the account of the battle of Newbury, come in naturally. What seems like fact is offered without apology. More marvelous stories are given with some qualification, as of Arthur's Round Table, "the tale whereof hath trundled so smoothly along for many ages, it never met with much belief among the judicious." Another still more doubtful story calls forth the remark, "no doubt the first founder of so damnable an untruth hath long since received his reward." Had Fuller tried, he could not have been dull for a page at a stretch.

Yet the author himself always spoke disparagingly of his historical studies. In 1647, in offering his *Good Thoughts in Worse Times* to the public, he admitted that a volume larger in bulk and profounder in content was expected of him. So he craved time of his creditors, as "many sufficient merchants" in London had been forced to do, and asked them to accept

"such small treatises . . . as interest, or consideration money" until he could "discharge the whole debt." Milton's serious request to the same end in *The Reason of Church Government* makes more clear the quaintness and homeliness of Fuller's expression. Again, in *A Pisgah-Sight of Palestine,* he expressed regret that his long-promised ecclesiastical history was again deferred. Lastly, in the *Worthies of England,* he promised solemnly never to "print book in the English tongue but what shall tend directly to divinity." But that promise appeared only after his death, and possibly he died with this regret in heart: "God foresaw I might suck to a surfeit in writing histories, which hath been a thief in the lamp of my life, wasting much oil thereof." He had never brought himself to observe his own precept: "It is a provident way before writing leaves us to leave off writing."

Too much, unquestionably, has been made of Fuller's quaintness of thought and expression. His mind was filled with those "diverting twists" that fascinated Elia. As a jester he met with only one serious rebuff. To the worthy churchman, Sparrow-hawk, he once proposed the following conundrum: "What is the difference between an owl and a sparrow-hawk." Quickly the answer came back to Fuller's discomfiture, "an owl is fuller in the head, fuller in the face, and fuller all over." Possibly he joked best, as Goldsmith argued, when he was alone. But no one should leave Fuller with this as a sole impression. His homely illustrations show that he knew life as well as books. A fine spirit of friendliness and sympathy pervades all his work. Toward childhood he showed something of Vaughan's and Traherne's sympathy when he wrote: "yea some admiring what motives to mirth Infants meet with in their silent and solitary smiles, have resolved (how truely I know not) that they converse with Angels, as indeed such cannot amongst mortals finde fitter Companions."[1] For man Fuller had the same friendliness. He was loyal to his university, to his old teachers, to friends, to his church and king. As thoroughly as Dr. Johnson, Fuller

[1] *Pisgah-Sight of Palestine.* Epistle Dedicatory.

stands forth a "true-born Englishman." He thought that the New England colonists had done wrong to leave their old homes for new lands; but he wished them God-speed, none the less. Such tolerance is his finest trait. In characteristic fashion he once accounted for his charity. His birthplace, he noted, was at Aldwinkle, a scant two miles from Achurch, on the one hand, where the leader of the Brownists had lived, and Lavenden, on the other, where once the home of one of the Gunpowder Conspirators had been. Hence his mission was to conciliate. As a reward, he was called by some blunt, by others two-faced. But had there been more like him in the troubled church, "the accommodation," to use his own words, "had been easy, with a little condescension on both sides."[2]

As a preacher Fuller seems to have satisfied in many ways the description that he drew up in his sketch, *A Faithful Minister,* while as a scholar and man of letters he satisfied the requirements of his *General Artist,* or the Man of Culture, as he would now be called. "He that sips of many arts drinks of none," he foresaw that some would object. But he had too many interests to confine himself to one sphere of life. He fulfilled his professional duties, as his sermons perhaps abundantly witness to-day; he added his poems, character sketches, and essays to the more purely literary output of his generation; his bulky histories evince his interest in scholarship; he shared in controversy with one opponent or another. Nevertheless, he lived close to the current of life, and took a keen interest in the stirring activities of those troubled times. All that Fuller has left, therefore, in verse and prose stands as an illuminating record of the intellectual and literary life of the seventeenth century.

[2] *A Commentary on Ruth.*

INDEX

Adagia, 48.
Addison, J., 20, 21, 23, 26.
Advice to a Daughter, 164.
Advice to a Son, 164.
Aelian, 48.
Aesop, 53.
Agrippa, C., 148.
Alciati, A., 29, 33, 39, 45, 48, 65.
Amanieu de Sescas, 138.
Amorum Emblemata, 60.
Aretino, 8.
Aristotle, 2, 5, 14, 128.
Arnaut de Marueil, 138.
Art des Emblemes, 33, 38, 39, 51, 54.
Art of Making Devises, 39.
Art Religieux, 42, 47.
Arte of Rhetorique, 6.
Arwaker, E., 58.
Ascham, R., 102, 104, 148-151.
Astell, M., 5, 164.
Audeley, J., 7.
Augustine, Saint, 99-100.
Ayenbite, etc., 131.
Ayres, P., 60.

Babees Book, 140.
Bacon, F., 12, 17, 19, 24, 32.
Baldwin, E., 1, 8, 9, 21, 24.
Balzac, J., 108-109.
Barber, J., 63.
Barclay, A., 6, 42-44.
Barzizza, G. da, 101.
Bellegarde, Abbot of, 171.
Bellman of London, 7.
Bercher, W., 148.
Beza, T., 31.
Biblia Pauperum, 47.
Blazon of Gentry, 129.
Blount, T., 39.
Bocchi, A., 34.
Boissard, J., 32.
Bonvesin da Riva, 138.
Book of Curtesye, 140.
Booke of Honour, 165.
Bornitius, J., 53.
Brandolini, A., 93.
Brandt, S., 42-43.
Brathwaite, R., 24, 27, 66, 161-164.
Breton, N., 19-20, 25, 104-106, 153.
Brown, T., 123.
Brunetto Latini, 138.
Bunyan, J., 40, 41, 63.
Burghley, Lord, 144, 167.
Butler, S., 20-23.

Callières, J. de, 113, 168.
Camerarius, J., 32, 45, 46, 52, 65, 66.
Camilli, C., 34, 52.
Canterbury Tales, 1, 7.
Cap for Gray Hairs, 163.
Capella, G., 148.
Casa, G. della, 138-141, 170.
Castiglione, B., 35, 105, 132-138.
Cats, J., 60.
Caveat, 7.
Cebes, 39-41.
Centum Fabulae, 44.
Centuria Una, 59.
Chamberlain, J., 101.
Characters of Virtues and Vices, 8-11.
Characters upon Essaies, 19.
Charron, P., 129.
Chastiement, etc., 138.
Chaucer, G., 1, 7.
Cheke, J., 102.
Chesterfield, Lord, 171.
Choice Emblems, 62.
Choice of Emblemes, 44, 48-51.
Christian Iconography, 47.
Cicero, 93, 96-98, 128.
Ciuil Conuersatione, 131.
Cleland, J., 26, 154-157.

Cleveland, J., 23.
Collection of Emblemes, 62.
Colloquium Puerpera, 146.
Combe, T., 58.
Commonwealth, etc., 132.
Compleat Gentleman, 157-160.
Contile, L., 33, 36, 39.
Continuation, etc., 70, 72, 73, 75, 77, 84.
Convito, 129.
Corrozet, G., 30.
Coryate, T., 7, 61.
Cotton, R., 103.
Country Parson, 27.
Country Rhymes, 63.
Courtier (Breton), 153.
Courtier, Book of, 105, 132-138.
Courtiers Academie, 137, 167.
Courtiers Calling, 113, 168-170.
Courtiers Manual, 167.
Cowley, A., 113, 123.
Cramer, D., 53.
Crane, T., 137, 138.
Crashaw, R., 66.

Dance of Death, 40-41, 63.
Daniel, S., 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39.
Dante, 129.
David, J., 47.
Davies, J., 24.
Day, A., 94-95, 105, 114.
De Boot, A., 34, 52.
De Bry, T., 32.
De Nobilitate, etc., 148.
De Nobilitate Civili, 130.
De Re Aulica, 137.
Defoe, D., 171.
Dekker, T., 7.
Del Galantuomo, 137.
Del Reggimento, 138.
Delle Allusioni, 51.
Delle Eccellenza, 148.
Description of England, 132.
Dial of Princes, 145.
Didron, A., 47.
Discorsi, 137.
Doctrine of Mortality, 53.
Documenti, etc., 138.
Documentum Honoris, 138.
Donne, J., 96, 111-113.
Drummond, W., 66.
Dryden, J., 26.
Du Refuge, E., 167.
Dyalogus Creaturarum, 46.

Earle, J., 13-16.
Education, Of, 167.
Ellis, C., 166.
Elyot, T., 141-143.
Emblemata Sacra, 59.
Emblematum Libellus, 29, 39.
Emblemes and Epigrams, 66.
Emblemes Heroiques, 51.
Emblemes of Love, 60.
Emblems of Mortality, 63.
English Gentleman, 27, 161-164.
English Gentlewoman, 27, 163.
English Secretorie, 94-95.
Enigmatical Characters, 23.
Enimie of Idlenesse, 94.
Epiphanius, 46.
Erasmus, D., 48, 92, 96, 140, 142, 146, 164.
Essayes and Characters, 24.
Estienne, H., 39.
Euphues, 105, 145-147.

Fables of Bidpai, 44, 53.
Fabricius, P., 51.
Faerie Queene, 147-148.
Faerno, G., 44, 48.
Farlie, R., 60.
Feltham, O., 24, 118.
Fenton, G., 106, 145.
Ferne, J., 129.
Ferro, G., 33, 35, 36, 53.
Fifty Courtesies, 158.
Figure of Foure, 106.
Filelfo, F., 101.
Flecknoe, R., 23.
Fortune des Gens, 113, 168.
Francesco da Barberino, 138.
François de Sales, 107-108.
Fraternity of Vagabonds, 7.
Fraunce, A., 39.
French Academie, 144.
Freytag, A., 52-53.

Fuller, T., 16-17, 25, 153, 173-183.
Fulwood, W., 94.

Galateo, 138-141, 170.
Gentile Sinner, 166.
Gentilhuomo, 130, 137.
Gentlemans Calling, 166.
Gentlemans Monitor, 168.
Gerbier, B., 152.
Gilbert, H., 143.
Golden Epistles, 106, 114, 145.
Golding, A., 144.
Gomberville, Sieur de, 53.
Good and the Badde, 20.
Gouernour, 141-143.
Gough, C., 8.
Gracian, B., 167.
Green, H., 35, 40, 46, 48, 51.
Guazzo, S., 131.
Guevara, A. de, 6, 106-107, 114, 145, 146.
Gulliver's Travels, 66.

H., I., 160.
Hall, J., 8-11, 110-111, 153, 173.
Happy Warrior, 1.
Harman, T., 7.
Harrison, W., 132.
Harvey, C., 58.
Harvey, G., 63, 103.
Healey, J., 3, 8.
Hecatongraphie, 30.
Hegendorff, C., 93.
Herbert, G., 27.
Heroicall Devises, 51.
Hesius, D., 59.
Heydon, J., 165.
Hieroglyphica, 45.
Hogarth, W., 67.
Hohburg, C., 58.
Holy and Profane State, 16-17, 25, 153.
Horace, 53.
Horapollo, 45.
Howell, J., 65, 107, 109, 114-117.
Hudibras, 21.
Hugo, H., 55, 56, 57.
Hurault, J., 144.

Iconologia, 36-38.
Imprese Illustri, 34, 52.
Insignium . . . Explicatio, 39.
Institution . . . Gentleman, 130-131, 132.
Institution . . . Nobleman, 26, 157.
Instructions for Youth, 167.

Jacobs, J., 44.
Jerome, Saint, 100.
Jonson, B., 4, 7-8, 25.
Joselyn, E., 164.
Jovius, P., 34, 35, 36, 39.
Junius, H., 31, 48.

Kalendarium, 60.
Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer, 70, 71.

La Bruyère, J. de, 26.
Ladies Calling, 164, 166.
Lamb, C., 26.
Lebendige Hertzens Theologie, 58.
Le Jay, G., 38.
Letter of Advice, 167.
Libanius, 8.
Lingard, R., 167.
Lithgow, W., 80.
Locher, J., 42.
London and Countrey, etc., 19
Loveday, R., 123.
Lupton, D., 19, 23.
Lychnocausia, 60.
Lyly, J., 145-147.

Macropedius, G., 93.
Mâle, É., 42, 47.
Many Remarkable Passages, 71.
Markham, F., 165.
Menestrier, C., 33, 38, 39, 51, 54.
Menosprecio, etc., 107, 146, 153.
Mercurius Aulicus, 74, 76, 79, 85.
Mercurius Britanicus, 70, 75, 76.
Mercurius Rusticus, 85.
Micro-cosmographie, 13-16.
Mignault, C., 29, 33.
Milton, J., 24, 88, 131, 152, 182.
Minerva Britanna, 61.

Mirrour of Fame, 160.
Mirrour of Maiestie, 61.
Mirrour of Policie, 144.
Moderate Intelligencer, 86-88.
Montaigne, M. de, 96, 108.
Morall Philosophy, etc., 53.
More, T., 35.
Mother Hubberds Tale, 145, 146.
Mulcaster, R., 131, 132, 151-152.
Mundus Symbolicus, 52, 54.
Muzio, G., 130, 137.
Mynshul, G., 18, 23.
Mythologia Ethica, 52-53.

Narrenschiff, 6, 42-44.
Nenna, G., 129.
Nennio, 129.
Newcastle, Duchess of, 118-120.
New England Primer, 62.
Nicomachean Ethics, 5, 143, 147.
Nifo, A., 137.
Nobylytye of Wymen, 148.

Osborne, D., 124-126.
Osborne, F., 123, 164.
Osorio, J., 129.
Ova Paschalia, 59.
Overbury, T., 8, 11-13, 24.
Oxford Diurnall, 70, 73, 76, 80, 81.

Palmer, A. Smyth-, 130.
Panton, E., 166-167.
Paradin, C., 48, 51.
Paradisus Sponsi, etc., 47.
Peacham, H., 61, 157-160.
Pecke, T., 165.
Perez, A., 107.
Perfect Diurnall, 70, 71, 73, 77, 79.
Perrière, G. de la, 144.
Petrarch, F., 100.
Petrasancta, Silvester, 51-52.
Petty, W., 152.
Philips, K., 120-123.
Philo, 128.
Physiologist, 46.
Physiologus, 45-46.
Pia Desideria, 55, 56, 57.
Picinello, F., 52, 54.
Picturae Loquentes, 23.
Pino, B., 137.
Plato, 40, 127.
Plautus, 8.
Pleasant Dialogues, 60.
Pliny, 98-99.
Poetical Rhapsody, 24.
Poggio, G., 101.
Polite Tutor, 171.
Poliziano, 94.
Pope, A., 26, 67.
Positions, 131-132, 151.
Poste . . . Letters, 104, 153.
Present Surveigh, 80.
Primaudaye, Peter de la, 129, 144.

Quarles, F., 55-58.

Ragionamento (Contile), 33, 36.
Ragionamento (Jovius), 36.
Raleigh, W., 167.
Redgrave, G., 29, 36.
Refin'd Courtier, 140.
Religious Emblems, 63.
Ripa, C., 36.
Robert of Blois, 138.
Rochester, Earl of, 123.
Rockinger, L., 92.
Romei, A., 137, 167.
Round-heads Remembrancer, 74.
Ruscelli, G., 34, 35, 36, 39.

Saltonstall, W., 23.
Salutato (Coluccio), 100.
Sambucus, J., 32, 44, 48, 51.
Savile, G., 164.
Schola Cordis, 58.
Scholemaster, 148-151.
Seelmann, W., 42.
Selden, J., 154.
Seneca, 97-98.
Serious Proposal, 164.
Shakespeare and Emblem Writers, 35, 40, 46, 48, 51.
Shepheards Calender, 65.
Ship of Fools, 42-44.
Sidney, P., 102.
Simulachres, 42.

Skelton, J., 145.
Smith, T., 132.
Sociable Letters, 118-120.
Sordello, 138.
Speciall Passages, 72.
Speculum Juventutis, 166-167.
Speculum Salvationis, 47.
Speed, J., 103.
Speedie Poste, 104.
Spelman, H., 103.
Spenser, E., 64-66, 145, 147-148.
Sphere of Gentry, 39.
Steinhausen, G., 91.
Stengel, G., 59, 66.
Stephens, J., 24.
Strappado, 163.
Strype, J., 103.
Stultifera Nauis, 42.
Suckling, J., 95, 123.
Swift, J., 66-67.
Symbola Heroica, 52.
Symbola Varia, 34, 52.
Symbolicarum . . . Libri Quinque, 34.
Symbolorum . . . Centuriae, 32, 45, 46, 52.
Symeon, G., 51, 52.

Taste of Letters, 118.
Teatro d' Imprese, 33, 35, 36, 53.
Ten Precepts, 144.
Tesoro, 138.
Theatre of Fine Divices, 58.
Theatre of Voluptuous Worldlings, 64-66.
Theatro Moral, 53.
Theophrastus, 2-6, 8, 24, 25, 29.
Thynne, F., 66.
Timotei, M., 137.
Toldo, P., 137.
Traitè de la Cour, 167.
Trenchfield, C., 163.
Triomphe, 38.
True Relation, 82-84.
True Use, 39.

Urfé, H. de, 108.

Valois, N., 92.
Van der Noodt, J., 64-66.
Van Veen, O., 53, 60.
Varia Historia, 48.
Vaughan, H., 15, 66, 182.
Vinycomb, J., 34.
Visions (Spenser), 65.
Vives, J., 93, 148, 164.
Voiture, V., 109-110.

Walsingham, E., 167.
Waterhouse, E., 39, 168.
Watson, H., 42.
Whimzies, 24.
Whitney, G., 44, 48-51.
Whole Duty, 166.
Wife, 11-13.
Willet, T., 59.
Wilson, T., 6, 12.
Wisdome, Of, 129.
Wither, G., 62.
Wordsworth, W., 1, 15.
Worthy Tract, 33, 34, 36.
Wotton, H., 35.
Wyrley, W., 39.

Xenophon, 40, 128.

PN
511
T53
1924
c.1
ROBA

UTL AT DOWNSVIEW
D RANGE BAY SHLF POS ITEM C
39 12 27 07 03 008 3